



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.


We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

1,081,458




E


171

A62


HSE

















AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

CONTENTS

Frontispiece	James Alexander	
Editorial Announcement		1
The Board of Proprietors of East New Jersey. From a Historical Address. By Cortlandt Parker, LL.D.		3
The Morris Family of Morrisania. By W. W. Spooner		25
The Fur Trade in the Early Development of the Northwest. By Henry M. Utley		45
Early New England Exploration of Our North Pacific Coast: The Columbia River. By Horace S. Lyman		52
The Discoverers of Lake Superior. By Henry C. Campbell		68
The Charter and Constitution of Connecticut. By Lynde Harrison		83

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE is issued on the fifteenth day each of January, March, May, July, September, and November. Subscribers failing to receive their copies by the first day of the succeeding month should immediately notify the publishers; otherwise it may not be possible to supply the missing number.

The contents of each number are protected by copyright. Permission to reprint any article or illustration must be specially obtained from the publishers.

Advertising rates will be furnished on application; none but strictly high-class advertising matter will be admitted. Advertisements must be received by the fifteenth day of the month preceding the month of issue.

Application made at the New York Post Office for entry as second-class mail matter.

THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK,
Publishers,
41 Lafayette Place,
New York, U. S. A.

Copyright, 1906, by
THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK,

All rights reserved.

#you



Ins. Alexander
Vor M

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

Vol. I

JANUARY, 1906

No. 1

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT.

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE will be published as a high class periodical, devoted to aspects of American history, to biography, and to genealogy. It will appear bi-monthly. The subscription price is three dollars per annum; single copies, fifty cents. It is not the organ of any society or interest, but, occupying an independent position, will be of comprehensive scope, undertaking to satisfy the best ideals of historical specialists and students, and devoting proportionate attention to the varied phases of the important subjects involved.

This magazine is established with an aim for a high standard of ability and merit. Specialized to historical and kindred topics, it will occupy a field to which only casual attention is given by the general periodicals of the day—with but indifferent regard, in most instances, for the fundamental requirements of accuracy, adequacy, and dignity of treatment.

The field of American history and genealogy is assuredly one of sufficient consequence to justify the expectation of a sustaining patronage for a first-class magazine devoted essentially to it.

170870

In embarking upon the enterprise, the publishers appreciate the excellent work done by the several existing periodicals on genealogical and historical lines. THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE will in no way enter into competition with them, except in the respect of friendly rivalry; which, by stimulating interest in American history and genealogy, and proposing to meet the higher standards of students of these subjects, will contribute to the broader recognition and usefulness of all conscientious co-laborers in the same field.

Each number will contain formal articles of note as to selection, solidity as to literary quality, and authority as to details of treatment, on American historical subjects. Arrangements have been made with writers of distinction and prominence for special contributions. The department of genealogy and biography will be a uniform feature, characterized by importance and thoroughness.

In submitting this first issue to the public we have pursued the broad lines of policy above announced. We believe no apology need be made for the omission of varied editorial departments of a purely conventional character. With the progress of the Magazine, adequate space will, however, be given to book reviews, editorial comment, correspondence and queries, societies, necrology, and other miscellany.

THE BOARD OF PROPRIETORS OF EAST NEW JERSEY.

(From a historical address.)

BY CORTLANDT PARKER, LL. D.

THE existence of a separate board or council of proprietors from whom all titles are derived, instead of obtaining them from the governing power, as is the case, I believe, in all the other states of the union, is a fact which, well understood among native Jerseymen, almost always seems strange to those who are not. And, therefore, it may be well, familiar as is the topic, to state succinctly how it came about that we had in New Jersey from the beginning, and have now as the fountain of all title, a private body of landowners.

The doctrine of English law was that discovery and conquest gave title, as to all heathen and uncivilized countries, to the British crown. To use judicial language (C. J. Kirkpatrick in *Arnold v. Mundy*, 1 Halstead, R. 1): "When Charles II. took possession of this country by his right of discovery, he took possession of it in his sovereign capacity. He had the same right in it and the same power over it as he had in and over his other dominions, and no more. This right consisted in granting the soil to private persons for the purposes of settlement and colonization; of establishing a government, of supporting a governor, and of conveying to him all those things appurtenant to the sovereignty, commonly called royalties, for the benefit of the colonists."

Both discovery and conquest, it is claimed, gave the British crown the title to New Jersey.¹ "The English first discovered and took possession of this part of North America. Being at war with the states of Holland, they were driven out by their enemy, who took possession and built the City of New York, calling it New Amsterdam. They extended their settlements into New Jersey, particularly into the adjacent counties of Bergen, Essex, Monmouth, Somerset, and Middlesex, the first European inhabitants of which were generally Hollanders. But in 1664 the English reconquered the territory and expelled the Dutch government. The king thus gained a new title by conquest of a civilized nation." On March 12, 1664, Charles II., by royal patent, granted New Jersey to his brother James, then Duke of York, afterwards Charles's successor upon the throne. Thus the landed property of New Jersey is held direct from the king of England.

This grant of the duke gave not only the property in the soil, but also the right and power of government. No other title to the soil than his was ever recognized by the law. It was unappropriated land, a savage wilderness, a great waste. "To such property the law appoints the king as owner, because there is no other. Moreover, it is a fundamental principle of the common law that all lands, even those of private persons, are held of the king. Where there is no private owner, therefore, all persons must claim through him." (3 Bl. Com., 49, 50.) In respect to the old settled and granted lands, this may be a fiction of law, but it is truth and history here. It was a newly discovered wilderness conquered by the king of England; it was the king's from necessity, and belonged to him solely, substantially, and beneficially.

Shortly after this deed, James, Duke of York, conveyed the land and the government to John, Lord Berkeley, and to Sir George Carteret. These men had been distinguished for their loyalty during the civil war, and the grant was an evi-

¹ Wall and Scott *arguendo*, 1 Halstead, 18, 50.

dent reward. Carteret had been governor of the island of Jersey, and was distinguished for his defence of it against the troops of the parliament. Hence the name Nova Caesarea, or New Jersey.

Philip Carteret, the first proprietary governor, with the first settlers under Berkeley and Carteret, arrived in New Jersey in the summer of 1665. By the treaty of Breda in 1667, New Jersey was formally ceded by the Dutch to the



BERKELEY AND CARTERET SEAL.

king of England. This gave rise to a new grant, July 29, 1674, by the king to the Duke of York and by the duke to Berkeley and Carteret anew. In July, 1676, the province was divided between the two proprietors, Carteret taking East Jersey and Berkeley West. Thereupon Carteret, by will, devised his plantation of New Jersey to trustees to be sold for

certain purposes, by him stated, in 1681-2. The trustees and his widow, executrix, sold all East Jersey to twelve proprietors, who again conveyed half of their interest to twelve others. This conveyance was strengthened by a release to the twenty-four by the Duke of York in 1682.

Each proprietor had a twenty-fourth interest in the property, inheritable, divisible, and assignable, as if it were a farm instead of a province. And by these means the estate has come down to those who now own the property. Every foot of ground in the state has once belonged to these proprietors, and belongs to its present owner, as their successor, by and through the rule of common and statutory law.

The rules of the proprietors, forming an agreement between them, have established two modes of conveying titles in severalty to their lands. One is by letters patent—a plan

pursued in the earliest period, but long ago abandoned,—the other by what is called warrant and survey, the method followed for many years past. It is thus clearly described by Chief-Justice Kirkpatrick: "The proprietors of New Jersey are tenants in common of the soil. Their mode of securing the common right is by issuing warrants from time to time to the respective proprietors, according to their respective and several rights, authorizing them to survey and appropriate in severalty the quantities therein contained. Such warrant does not convey a title to the proprietor; he had that before. It only authorizes him to sever so much from the common stock, and operates as a release to testify such severance. This is manifestly the case when the proprietor locates for himself. When, instead of locating for himself, he sells his warrant to another, that other becomes a tenant in common with all the proprietors *pro tanto*, and in the same manner he proceeds to convert his common into a several right. It is true that the survey made in pursuance of this warrant must be inspected by the surveyor-general, approved by the board, and registered in their books; but all this is for the sake of security, order, and regularity only, and is by no means the passing of the title. It proves that the title has passed, but it is not the means of passing it."

As survey after survey has been made upon warrant, approved and registered, the domain of common land has diminished in extent. But at least until all New Jersey has been so disposed of this board must continue to exist.

The United States government owns, or rather has owned, all the great west through conquest or through treaty. Therefore a party desiring land goes to the government officer, and on complying with established regulations gets a patent or a deed. The states respectively own lands within their boundaries. They acquired them, each for itself, by conquest or treaty, or later by taxation and sale therefor. In New Jersey, however, our legislature has nothing at all

to do with our waste or unappropriated land. It all belongs to the proprietors, to those, namely, who own what are known as proprietary rights, or rights of proprietorship, and is subject to the disposition of the board of proprietors. Anyone who holds one-quarter share of propriety, I understand to be admissible to a seat as one of the board. . . .

It was the day of small things, this infancy of New Jersey. Its first legislative assembly met May 26, 1668. Thirty pounds was levied on the different towns to defray the public charges—five pounds on each of the six towns. When Philip Carteret came, first governor of the colony, he found at Elizabeth, his future residence, four families. What a kingdom that must have seemed to him, a youth of twenty-six, clothed abroad with the title of governor of the Province of Nova Cæsarea, when he came to this wilderness and found what was its population. He was equal to the occasion. As he left his vessel at the port, he went to the settlement with a hoe on his shoulder that all might see that he, like the inhabitants already come, was to be a planter. A good young man was he, who endeavored with all his might to maintain the peace and increase the property of the infant province. He had not a peaceable time. Indeed, anything like constant peace was the lot of very few of New Jersey's early governors. Governor Andros of New York disputed Carteret's authority; nay, failing by peaceable means to gain his point, he sent a party of soldiers by night, who dragged Carteret from his bed, carried him to New York, and there kept him close until a day was set on which he was tried before his opponent himself in the New York courts, and three times acquitted by the jury, who were sent back with directions to convict, but firmly each time refused. The authority of Carteret was confirmed by the Duke of York, and Andros was recalled. But Jersey was then an insignificant place indeed. For Governor John Winthrop of Connecticut, writing July 18, 1665,

speaks of it thus: "New Jersey, which is a place I know not, nor never have heard where it is."

Woodbridge, in 1667, and Newark, in 1666, were settled from New England on the invitation of Governor Carteret, and in consequence of the favorable terms which he held out. The settlers were to extinguish the Indian title for themselves, and, that being done, a nominal quit rent only was demanded. Thus more strong blood was transplanted to New Jersey. It had Holland blood some years before in Bergen and in Somerset. It acquired Puritan in 1666, and Huguenots came with the Dutch. Some years afterward came the Scotch, who first settled Amboy, called it Perth after their most distinguished companion, and made it the home of Johnstons, Gordons, Skinners (properly McGregors), Alexanders, Hamiltons, Barclays, Fullertons, Scotts, Rutherfurds, and other Scottish folk. This infusion had much to do with the shaping of the colony. The decided and conservative character of East New Jersey, the enterprise of Newark, the sturdy industry of our agricultural counties, the independence of all—in short, the individuality of the state, more striking perhaps than that of any other, is the plain outgrowth of the fusion of their different but excellent nationalities. There is no frivolity in the character of any of these compounds, and the absence of excitability, of gregarious following of leaders or adoption of ideas, is a marked attribute to-day of the native Jerseyman.

The council of Governor Carteret were persons not much known to fame, then or ever. The leading man among them was a Frenchman named Robert Vauquellen, first surveyor-general of the province, who with his wife accompanied the governor in his passage across the sea. The trustees of Sir George Carteret could not make sale of East Jersey. After ineffectual attempts at private sale they offered it at public auction, and William Penn and eleven associates, most if not all Quakers, bought it for £3,400. It was too heavy a

purchase, apparently, for their management. Each sold half his right to another, and so were constituted the twenty-four proprietors. They procured a deed of confirmation from the Duke of York March 14, 1682, and then the twenty-four lords proprietors, by sealed instrument, established a council, gave them power to appoint overseers, and displace all officers necessary to manage their property, to take care of their lands, deed them, appoint dividends, settle the rights of

particular proprietors in such dividends, grant warrants of survey, in fine, to do everything necessary for the profitable disposition of all the territory. The council was always to represent one-third of the general proprietors.

The new proprietors were men of rank. William Penn is known to all the world. With him were James, Earl of Perth, John Drummond, Robert Barclay, famous, like Penn, as a Quaker gentleman and a controversialist for Quaker be-



ANDREW HAMILTON.

lief; David Barclay, Robert Gordon, Arent Sonmans, Robert West, Thomas Rudyard, a lawyer who had won fame in London as defender of William Penn; Samuel Groom, Thomas Hart, Richard Mew, Ambrose Rigg, John Heywood, Hugh Hartshorn, progenitor of the distinguished landowners as stated near Sandy Hook; Clement Plumsted, Thomas Cooper, Gawen Lawrie, Edward Byllinge, James Brain, William

Gibson, Thomas Barker, Robert Turner, and Thomas Warne.

Robert Barclay was appointed governor for life, but with liberty to act by deputy, and Thomas Rudyard was selected for this office. He came here in 1683, and his council were Lewis Morris of Barbadoes, a large iron man in Monmouth, John Barr, and William Sanford, with others less known to fame.

Gawen Lawrie succeeded Rudyard in a very short time after the latter's appointment, and under him a considerable Scotch emigration took place. Under him, too, Perth Amboy was laid out, a favorite object with the early proprietors. Lawrie held his office but a little while, and to him succeeded Lord Neill Campbell, a brother of the Duke of Argyle, implicated with him in treasonable invasion of Scotland in 1685. He retained Gawen Lawrie as one of his council. He remained, however, scarcely a year, appointing Andrew Hamilton as his substitute. Troubles sprang up during his administration, with New York, to settle which Hamilton set out for England, but on his passage was captured by the French and for some time detained.

Governorships were short in the new province. Hamilton, reappointed in 1692—and to whose care as governor West Jersey was also confided,—who was likewise during the same period postmaster-general of America, held office no longer than 1697, England having passed an act requiring that proprietary governors should be approved by the king, and that no other than a native of England should hold an office of trust or profit. The proprietors unwillingly parted with him. Jeremiah Basse succeeded him, but troubles recurring, Hamilton came back in 1699, and retained the office till his death in 1703.

In 1702 occurred the surrender to Queen Anne of the right of government, an event having an unintended but most important effect on the extent of the proprietary domain; an effect, however, not announced, if discovered, till many years

had intervened. Lord Cornbury then came, first governor under the crown. This event diminished greatly the consequence of the board. Its nominee no longer gave or communicated, or was required to approve the laws of the province. It became what it ought to have been from the beginning, merely an association of landowners. But men of great eminence and force still managed the body. Singularly enough, as it seems to me, it was never formally incorporated. I suppose that it may, nevertheless, be a corporation. While there existed much land undisposed of, the active directors of the association were men who made their mark. Such were Lewis Morris, John Burnet, Richard Ashfield, James Alexander, John Johnston, John Parker, John Hamilton, Lewis Johnston, Andrew Johnston, Joseph Murray, Samuel Nevill, Robert Hunter Morris, Elisha Parker, John Stevens, Walter Rutherford, Cortlandt Skinner, William Skinner, William Burnet, David Ogden, acting for the sons of William Penn, Oliver De Lancy, Henry Cuyler, Jr., and William Alexander, Lord Stirling. I give the prominent names from 1735 to 1764. . . .

First to be mentioned, because of his absorbing interest in proprietary rights, is the distinguished James Alexander. The minutes of the council of proprietors from 1725 to 1756 are a monument of the devotion, zeal, intelligence, and unremitting and absorbing care of this gentleman for the interests of this association. How much earlier he bestowed this attention I am not able from the material furnished me to say. But during this period it might be said of him that he well-nigh embodied the board. If he did not with his own hand pen the minutes, they must have received his particular and most scrupulous supervision. They recount his history and the employment of his time. They refer to incidents now historical and most valuable to the general public. They ought to be sought for by the state and published in the collections of her archives.

We form our ideas of the character of Washington by studying not only his public and private correspondence, but his minute and exact and just accounts. We think him a greater Washington because we find him making record of the most unimportant particulars with his own hand. We increase our good opinion of him by noticing the neatness, precision, and clearness of his handwriting, and anyone who will peruse these minutes, tiresome as he may find the task, will rise from it with a conviction that James Alexander was a man of highest value, and inestimably useful to the proprietors, and through them to all who under them own the land composing East New Jersey.

It was not the fashion in those days, as it is perhaps too much so now, to make the death of an associate the occasion for eulogistic corporate action. I am not sure that this huge book of minutes contains any passed in relation to any other of the very distinguished gentlemen who, during that period, deceased. But when he died, in 1756, a letter of condolence to Mrs. Alexander, reported by a committee composed of Robert Morris, Richard Ashfield, Richard Peters, and Cortlandt Skinner, was addressed to the widow of their old associate in the following words:

"Madam: The council of proprietors of East New Jersey take this opportunity of their first meeting since the death of Mr. Alexander to make you and your family their sincere and cordial condolence on this mournful and unexpected event. When alive they esteemed him, they trusted him, they loved him. They have reason, therefore, now that he is taken from them, to bear part in your grief, having lost their counsellor, their friend, and their unwearied assistant.

"The council, sensible of the manifold obligations his friendship and services have laid them under, think it their duty to assure the family that we shall never fail to give them all the assistance in our power for completing their titles or the recovering their rights to any land of his in this division, or to do anything else which you shall be advised we can do for your benefit."

At the same meeting his son, William Alexander, Lord Stirling, was made surveyor-general in his father's room, who had held the office so long that precedents for a commis-

sion were directed to be sought for. He became such in 1716, forty years before his death.

James Alexander was a Scotchman. He was out in the rebellion of 1715, in which his friend and sometime associate, the afterward Rev. William Skinner of Perth Amboy, believed on best authority to have really been a leader of the Clan MacGregor, participated. He took refuge here the next year. He was a proficient in mathematics, and distinguished as an engineer.

Notwithstanding that he was a political refugee, he enjoyed the friendship and patronage of the great Duke of Argyle, immortalized by Scott in the "Heart of Midlothian," and through him had the good will of the representatives here of the house of Brunswick. Soon after arriving in New York he received an official appointment and won distinction in it. He soon obtained the post of surveyor-general both in New York and New Jersey, and in 1720 Governor Burnet, another Scotchman, made him a member of his council. While thus employed Mr. Alexander studied law, and when called to the bar became rapidly eminent, not as a speaker, his eulogists grant that, but for profound legal knowledge, sagacity, and penetration. He enjoyed the good fortune, however, rare for any lawyer, of identifying his name with an historical cause, the trial of John Peter Zenger, printer of the *New York Weekly Journal*, for libel. . . .

Whilst this cause was going on in New York, Mr. Alexander, interested as a large proprietor, as surveyor-general in New Jersey, and as general counsel and factotum of the council of proprietors here, was engaged in looking after the popular difficulties in New Jersey which terminated in the celebrated lawsuit in our chancery between the proprietors as complainants, and what were called by them the "Clinker Lot Right men," which suit was begun by the filing of what is popularly known as the Elizabethtown bill in chancery.

Alexander here was not on the popular side. Though the

population of East New Jersey, at that time, could scarcely have been twenty thousand, yet the feeling seems to have been intense. Trespasses, ejectments, riots, gaol breakings were the order of the day, and for ten years lawsuits, their progress and their issue, were the chief employments of the half yearly councils. Eminent counsel from New York assisted. But the burden of the conflict, with all its tremendous detail, fell upon Mr. Alexander, aided, perhaps, at the very last, by Elisha Parker of Amboy, then or soon afterwards his son-in-law, who was solicitor of record but died soon after the filing of the bill.

It would be difficult, indeed, to tell the story of this cause, considering that the bill, the statement of the case for the proprietors, fills eighty double-columned printed pages, each about eighteen inches long, and the exhibits and appendices nearly ninety more, much of them in finer print and containing many more words. This bill is the foundation of the history of East New Jersey, from the beginning up to its filing, April 13, 1745. Its object was to establish the title of the proprietors against any other title up to that time alleged against it, to enforce it against recusant parties, to dissolve and enjoin an alleged conspiracy among the defendants hostile to it, and to enjoin all waste and the prosecution of certain ejectments affecting it.

The jurisdiction of the court of chancery on this bill has, I believe, been long somewhat questioned. But its object was somehow finally attained. The title denied to the proprietors and asserted in this bill founded on the grants of Charles the Second to the Duke of York, of the Duke of York to Berkeley and Carteret, and thence to the twenty-four proprietors and their assigns, has not seriously, for over one hundred years, been disputed in New Jersey.

It has, indeed, been held that adverse possession may be set up even against the proprietors, and under this doctrine,

in some cases, the proprietary title has failed. But the title itself has never during that period been impugned.

The learning, labor, ingenuity, fertility of resources, competency to deal with detail, and general legal ability displayed in originating and carrying on this suit, entitle Mr. Alexander to very high rank as a lawyer. No one can doubt it who takes the trouble to study this bill, especially if he will also read the minutes of the board during the ten or fifteen years of the gestation, birth, and maintenance of this suit.

The establishment of the northern boundary between New York and New Jersey was another subject which engrossed the industrious and painstaking mind of Mr. Alexander, but without being finished during his life.

The fatal illness of Mr. Alexander arose from journeying to Albany when already ill, to oppose a ministerial scheme oppressive to the people. He was not only distinguished as a statesman and a lawyer, but also as a man of science. He is reputed the principal author of the memorable report on the Indian policy of Governor Burnet, and with Dr. Franklin, Francis Hopkinson, and others founded the American Philosophical Society. He was a constant correspondent with Halley, the astronomer, and other learned men of science. About 1726 he married a wealthy widow, a Mrs. Provoost. He left one son, William, Lord Stirling, a major-general in the Revolution, ancestor through one of his two daughters of the eminent John Duer, William A. Duer, and their descendants; and four daughters, one of whom married Peter Van Brugh Livingston, and was ancestress of the family of Keans; Elizabeth, who married John Stevens, ancestress thus of all the scions of that noted Jersey family; Catherine, who first married Elisha Parker, and on his death, without issue, Walter Rutherford, mother thus of that equally distinguished race; and Susanna, who married John Reid.

Some correspondence appended to the life of William Livingston shows that just before he died, Alexander, Cadwal-

lader Colden, Mr. Livingston, and Benjamin Franklin were busy planning a scheme for uniting all the colonies under one government, subordinate to the crown, a scheme not unlike that now existing in the Dominion of Canada. Had it succeeded, what might have been the present condition of this hemisphere?

The length to which I have insensibly carried this notice of James Alexander precludes my bestowing equal attention on his very able associates in proprietorship. And yet I cannot wholly omit them. Of some I must not speak, since I have derived from them my own lineage. There was Lewis Morris, governor to succeed John Hamilton, himself a familiar face at the board, appointed in 1738,¹ . . . and it were hard to leave this list of worthies without dwelling upon the Johnstons. Dr. John Johnston, one of the most valued citizens of the province, a man of learning and skill, whose death—it was published—was to the inexpressible loss of the poor, who were always his most particular care, was the first of these. His son Andrew, once president of the board, who died in 1762, was, according to history, “a man of great equality of temper, circumspection of conduct, and open, yet grave, engaging mien, much goodness of heart, and many virtues, both public and private.” Dr. Lewis Johnston was another member, and son of the first name. Equally hard is it to omit the mention of others who distinguished themselves and were progenitors of distinguished men; such as Michael Kearny, whose blood was in the veins of two of the nation’s heroes, Lawrence Kearny of the navy and Philip Kearny of the army; and Thomas Gordon, from whom came several of his own name famous in history; and also the honored family of Hamersley.

I mention but one more of the ante-revolutionary worthies, Samuel Nevill. He was the eldest brother of the wife of

¹ For an account of his career the reader is referred to the article on the Morris Family in this issue.

Peter Sonmans, a well-known early settler of New Jersey. On her death, in 1735-6, he left London, where he was practicing at the bar and likewise editing the *Morning Post*, and came to Perth Amboy, where he settled, and was distinguished, rising to the bench of the supreme court through membership of the assembly and various other minor offices. He is known to the profession as the publisher of Nevill's Laws, and was known to others as editor of a magazine published at Woodbridge by James Parker, the printer, the first periodical in New Jersey, the second upon the continent. He was Mr. Alexander's right hand man in all the litigation as to proprietary title. He died in 1764.

The Revolution of 1776 swept away the greatness of Perth Amboy and the grandees of the council of proprietors. The little city was for awhile under the guns of the British, and was then occupied by them. Several of the principal citizens and proprietors took farms and lived in Hunterdon. Such was the case with John Stevens and James Parker, residents of Amboy, and with John Rutherford, and I believe with others. When the war ended the glory of Amboy was gone. Its greatness had departed, and the council of proprietors no longer assembled so many distinguished persons. Yet some remained. There was William Alexander, Lord Stirling, of whom we have spoken, who was appointed surveyor-general in 1761. There was John Rutherford, selected for the same office in 1771. And Andrew Bell came back, and in 1804 was made surveyor-general, holding the office thirty-eight years, and till his death in 1842. James Parker came from Hunterdon, and his son succeeded him at his death in 1796, and filled the office of register for many years. There were others of note, among them a shrewd, canny inhabitant of Sussex, Joseph Sharp, and a natty, comfortable gentleman from Monmouth, Robert Montgomery, upon the whiff of whose pipe I have often looked when a diminutive small boy.

The most distinguished of these proprietors since the Revolution were John Rutherford and Andrew Bell. In speaking of them I rely upon memory as well as publications. I remember them both well.

John Rutherford, son of Walter and Catharine, widow of Elisha Parker, *nee* Alexander, was a tall, gaunt person, very distinguished in his appearance, rather pale in countenance, sedate and grave in expression, yet full of intelligence and fire. At this time he was of very advanced years. He was born in 1760, graduated from Princeton College in 1775, married Helen, daughter of Lewis Morris, a signer of the Declaration of Independence (grandson of the Governor Lewis Morris already mentioned), was senator of the United States from 1791 to 1793, and filled other important public positions. He died in 1840. He lived in a large mansion on the banks of the Passaic two miles north of Belleville, where he had a fine estate. I suppose he was the largest landowner ever in New Jersey.

Who that ever knew him can fail to remember Andrew Bell—"Uncle Bell," as he was called by so many that had no right to the appellation of his nephews or nieces, that finally it came to pass that pretty much everybody adopted the endearing phrase. A fine old English gentleman he was—"one of the olden time,"—though one must admit that, vexed as he was throughout his life with painful gout, and never, so far as known, having had the hardihood to own or use hunters, all of the grand old song can scarcely be used in application to him. Yet much of it can, nevertheless:

"He kept his fine old mansion at a bountiful old rate,

With a good old porter to relieve the old poor at his gate."

He was an embodiment of kindness, hospitality, and good will; a scholar, a charitable, excellent old man, understanding fully the duty of minding his own business and letting other people's alone. He lived with his charming old wife and a maiden sister until their united ages exceeded two

hundred and fifty years. His early life was one of excitement, in strong contrast to his later days. He studied law in the office of Cortlandt Skinner, attorney-general of the province, a whig and a leader of whigs, till the question of armed rebellion took place, when he took sides with the government to which he had sworn allegiance and raised and commanded a brigade through the Revolutionary struggle. With young Bell, in the same office, studied Joseph Bloomfield, afterward governor of New Jersey. The lads parted; Bell joined the British; was for awhile private secretary of Sir Henry Clinton, then commissary in the army. He was at the battle of Monmouth and there encountered in arms on the other side two Paterson brothers; one, I believe, the distinguished William Paterson, his brother-in-law. But it was difficult to believe, when one knew him, that such as he had ever been in battle. In 1804 he became surveyor-general of East Jersey, and died in office, 1842, in the eighty-sixth year of his age. A stout, middle-sized man, with an exceedingly florid complexion and the whitest of hair, carrying always his gold-headed cane, and zealously attending the ancient Episcopal Church of St. Peter's, of which he was for thirty-three years a warden, gathering up its contributions every Sunday. No one, I think, who ever saw him can forget the face and form of Andrew Bell.

With him I conclude my efforts to put before you the lords proprietors, as they were called first, in an adoption of feudal language; later, with more or less derision of the past. And yet I am tempted to give the roll of surveyors-general since Mr. Bell; beginning with his nephew, Stephen Van Rensselaer Paterson, twin brother of Judge William Paterson, and comprising the very capable Francis W. Brinley, renowned as one of the best surveyors the state ever produced; in office from 1845 to 1859; his son, Edward Brinley, John Rutherford the second, Munro Howell, and Prof. George H. Cook. . . .

The title of the governor in those days was something alarming. The bill in chancery already mentioned was addressed to "His Excellency, Lewis Morris, Esq., Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of the Province of New Jersey and territories depending in America, and Vice-Admiral in the same."

In 1682 a liberal computation made the inhabitants of all East Jersey three thousand five hundred. A still more liberal estimate makes the number in 1693 ten thousand. In 1700 Governor Hamilton thought the males over sixteen in both East and West Jersey not more than two thousand—justifying the estimate of population as scarcely more than seven years previously. A census taken in 1725 gave the population of both provinces as 32,442; Monmouth being the most populous county, Essex the second, Burlington the third, Middlesex the fourth. Another census taken in 1737 gives the population of East Jersey as 23,395; fifty-three years after, in 1790, it was 111,272. There could not have been in 1776 more than fifty thousand people in all East Jersey; in 1745 about half that number.

Such a computation gives us no very grand idea of the importance of the lives of the really and evidently eminent men whose names and characters have been brought before you. And yet luxury and display most unreasonable was early the order of the day. "The style of dress," says Mrs. Lamb, "was very showy and conspicuous. Gay pendants were worn in the ears, costly crosses were suspended about the neck, and diamonds and rich brocades were esteemed essential to respectability among the wealthier families; tight lacing and wide skirts prevailed, though not as extensively as a few years later. The hair was frizzled and curled, and arranged in a great variety of fantastic ways." The gentlemen outdid the ladies; they concealed their hair altogether by enormous wigs, which were supposed to greatly beautify the countenance. An advertisement in the *New York Gazette*

of 1773 throws a glimmer of light upon the prevailing fashion: "Morrison, Peruke maker from London, dresses gentleman's and ladies' hair in the politest taste. He has a choice parcel of human, horse, and goat hair to dispose of." And another: "Tyes, bobs, majors, spencers, fox-tails and twists, together with curls or tales for the ladies." Bright colors everywhere prevailed. The most gorgeous combinations appeared in the fabrics for a lady's wardrobe, and gentlemen wore coats and other garments that came in all the hues of the rainbow. Large silver buttons adorned coats and vests, often with the initial of the wearer's name engraved upon each button. Occasionally an entire suit would be decorated with conch shell buttons, silver mounted. Even coaches were painted and gilded in an extraordinary manner. A writer of the day, seeing the equipage of Lewis Morris rolling down Broadway towards the fort, speaks of its silver mountings glittering in the sunshine, and of the family arms emblazoned upon it in many places. The crest was a spacious stone castle with little turrets and battlements, the motto being "*Tandem vincitur*," which was supposed to declare the virtue, perseverance, magnanimity, and success of the Morris Family against oppression of whatever character. Even servants aped their masters in style. We quote advertisements:

"Ran away, a negro servant clothed with damask breeches, black broadcloth vest, a broadcloth coat of copper color, lined and trimmed with black, and black stockings."

"Ran away, a negro barber; wore a light wig, a gray kersey jacket lined with blue, a light pair of drugget breeches with glass buttons, black roll-up stockings, square-toed shoes, a white vest with yellow buttons and linings."

These in 1731 and 1734.

Architecture had scarcely, perhaps, attained in this country all that the era of Queen Anne exhibited in London. That is reserved, it seems, for our own days. But wherever the money came from (the most lucrative business was the slave trade), fashion and folly made most extravagant use of it, as well in the humbler Province of New Jersey as in the

ambitious City of New York. Those who would have a minute conception of the men and women of that day, need subtract little from those of England at the same period. The polished periods of Macaulay, Thackeray, and the late history of the Four Georges, by Justin McCarthy, will enable all to see as in a mirror the lords proprietors of 1684 to 1764, their families, and their mode of life.

I was lately on the water stretching between Paulus Hook and New Amsterdam, when a marvellous sight invited my admiring gaze. Up the stream, and passing in front of me, came a ship, a mammoth of the deep, her deck containing in square feet half an acre; her hull enclosing some five thousand tons of measurement, silent, majestic, swift, cleaving the pure water which seemed to cling delighted to her sides; without a sail, moving against the wind, standing up like a huge house, her gunwale twenty feet above the waves, while her keel sank in them an equal depth; the flag of England at her peak, and a banner with stripes and stars from her naked topmast; her deck, from stem to stern, covered with men and women gazing curiously, half-astonished, half-delighted, on the scene around, while all about and around her moved crowds of craft, each peculiar and individual; some small snorting vessels, shooting hither and thither, now with great barges towed behind, now with huge ships, their bows turned seaward, some tortoise-shaped with windows innumerable on each side, speeding across the current, some almost as large as the great monster just arrived; hastening every way, while lazy ships lay anchored, ugly guns grinning through their port-holes, or with shrouds and rigging filled with fluttering garments hung to dry, and little boats with sail or oar flitted here and there—in a word, with all the variety, bustle, and life of the harbor of that city, already great, almost beyond compare, in no great time to be the acknowledged commercial capital of the universe. The mammoth, whence? From Great Britain, a week since, obedient

to the panting engine and propelled by the silent screw. And still more wonderful, her departure, learned through lightning under the sea, while the news of her arrival by the same swift messenger was already in London, friend congratulating friend through a mysterious clicking managed by a boy. The sight was not uncommon. Nay, it was so much the contrary that only here and there among the throngs who blocked each other's way upon the shore on either side did scarce one care to waste a thought on so ordinary an occurrence. And the crowds upon the monster's deck were soon jostling each other on their way ashore, seeking the strange iron rail and the smoking, tireless iron horse, to speed them thence to their destinations throughout the country, thousands of miles, some of them, away, where natural and artificial wonders were the daily enjoyment or sustentation of millions upon millions of industrious, happy people.

Two centuries ago one of your forefathers or mine stood upon the shore gazing excited over the same expanse upon a ship which was making its way into the port of Perthtown, then surveyed and mapped out, indeed, but a hamlet with "ten or twelve houses thirty feet long, sixteen or eighteen wide, ten feet betwixt joint and joint with a double chimney made with timber and clay," as the manner of the country was to build. Forests lined each shore, and from the headlands peered forth here a coffee-colored face, there one of European origin, by no means joyful, yet curious at the unusual sight. Such an one, indeed, had never before saluted vision there. Here was a ship of three hundred and fifty tons, loaded with weary, hungry, sick, destitute, and many enslaved human beings, the remnant of a company which set sail months before and nearly half of whom, seventy out of two hundred, from pestilence, starvation, storms, and cruelty, had succumbed to misery and found a watery grave. Of the two hundred, one hundred and thirty were taken from prisons, where they were held for disobedience to laws inter-

dicting religious liberty, and accepted banishment with more or less willingness to escape greater misery at home. With what sad eyes did they gaze upon a land only welcome as an exchange for a prison, and where to pay the cost of their journey they were to be slaves for a term of years! With these were others who sought the wilderness with hope and to acquire freedom; but such were few among the many. This was the ship's company—the freight of the "Henry and Francis," the first emigration induced by the lords proprietors, the earliest settlers direct from the parent country, of the Province of East New Jersey. And now while the then hamlet is still far behind in the race of cities, her beautiful shore looking out to sea, over her magnificent bay, still unappreciated by the capital and taste of the century, her many natural advantages passed strangely by, while other less favored spots are greedily appropriated; yet around and about her is a population of millions, happier, or at least having the right to be happier, than all the world beside; the descendants of the miserable wanderers of 1685, scattered everywhere, most of them utterly ignorant of their origin, contributing to the strength and felicity of this broad land, whose freedom excels all other freedom because it is the freedom of God's truth.

Vainly do we guess, as we look back these two hundred years, what a change a like period hereafter may produce. Profitless indeed is the thought. Yet, meditating on the progress of the past, what may not be expected? The work of the "council of proprietors" is all but done. They must hereafter be not title-makers so much as title-keepers, or better yet, as once they gave up to sovereignty the reins of government, they will do best to sell and government will be wise to acquire from them their remaining claims of right and the custody of their records. This done, the mission of the council of proprietors of East New Jersey will be accomplished.

THE MORRIS FAMILY OF MORRISANIA.

BY W. W. SPOONER.

THE Morris Family of Morrisania traces its American ancestry to *Captain Richard Morris* (I.), of ancient and aristocratic Welsh descent, who, after serving with distinction in the parliamentary army under Cromwell, removed to the West Indian island of Barbadoes, married there, and presently, with his young wife, came to New York. In 1670, conjointly with his elder brother, Colonel Lewis Morris (who had remained at Barbadoes), he purchased a property called Bronxland, of five hundred acres, on the north side of the Harlem River, comprising the original lands which were granted in 1639 by



MORRIS ARMS

the Dutch West India Company to Jonas Bronck, the first settler in Westchester County. Captain Morris took up his residence on the estate thus acquired, where both he and his wife died two years later, leaving an infant son, *Lewis Morris* (II.). Soon after Richard's death, Colonel Lewis Morris of Barbadoes, disposing of his interests on that island, established himself on the Bronxland property, which he administered in his own right and as guardian for his infant nephew. Under him the estate was increased to nearly two thousand acres, and in addition he became the proprietor of extensive lands in the Province of New Jersey. Dying without male issue, Colonel Morris left his entire American possessions to the young Lewis. The latter, in 1697, procured from Governor Fletcher a royal patent, erecting Bronxland

into a manor, under the name of the *Manor of Morrisania*; and as such it continued until the Revolution. Lewis Morris, the first "lord" of the manor, became one of the most distinguished and influential men of his times in America; holding, among other high offices, those of chief-justice of New York and governor of New Jersey. He left two sons, *Lewis Morris* (III.) and Robert Hunter Morris (III.). The former (ancestor of the family whose history is traced in this memoir) succeeded in the Manor of Morrisania, and was prominent in public life in New York, serving as judge of the court of admiralty under the crown, and in other stations; the latter inherited the New Jersey lands of his father, and was chief-justice of that province and governor of Pennsylvania. Lewis Morris (III.) had four sons, all of whom rose to prominence, as follows: *Lewis Morris* (IV.), third lord of the manor, signer of the Declaration of Independence, general in the Revolution, etc.; Staats Long Morris (IV.), who became an officer in the British army previously to the Revolution, continued in that service abroad (though taking no part in the American war), attained the full rank of general, and married into one of the great families of the kingdom; *Richard Morris* (IV.), judge under the crown and second chief-justice of the State of New York, and *Gouverneur Morris* (IV.), the eminent patriot and statesman, minister to France, United States senator, etc. From Lewis Morris the Signer, Judge Richard Morris, and Gouverneur Morris various lines have sprung, which have worthily maintained the position and prestige of the family. It is to these lines, and more particularly to several of their present representative branches, that the succeeding pages are devoted.

For a correct historical view of the subject, it should first be understood that the Morris Family of Morrisania, though in every way the most consequential early American stock of that name, by no means comprehended all the Morrisses of note in colonial and revolutionary times, as at the present

day it does not sustain genealogical relation to any of the other Morris families (some of them of much consideration), which are distributed quite numerous throughout the country. From time immemorial the ancestral home of the Morrisania Morrisises was Wales; and it was from Monmouthshire in that country that Captain Richard Morris and his brother, Colonel Lewis Morris, came. So far as has been ascertained, none of the other early Morrisises in America were of the same, or of even closely related, ancestry; although certain circumstances in connection with several of these are suggestive of a cognate origin.¹

Early History.

The principal source of information concerning the an-

¹The celebrated loyalist, Colonel Roger Morris, was unquestionably of the same original Welsh stock as the Morrisania Morrisises. He was a member of the Morris Family of Netherby in the North Riding of Yorkshire, England, which, according to Burke ("General Armoury"), was of ancient Welsh lineage, "being of those who claim descent from Elystan Glodrydd, Prince of Ferlys." The Netherby family, moreover, had the same arms—not even varying as to tinctures—as those borne by the descendants of Captain Richard Morris in America, "gules, a lion rampant regardant or"; although, naturally, the quartering and crest differed. Colonel Roger Morris, as is well known, m. Mary Philipse, daughter of Frederick Philipse, of Philipseburgh Manor, which was adjacent to Morrisania Manor in Westchester County. It is a curious historical circumstance that two such conspicuous families, descending from the same ancient Welsh progenitor though with no immediate ties of blood, of equal social consideration though totally different political principles, appeared together in the same county at a critical period of American history, in which both were destined to play a notable part.

In 1683, thirteen years after the arrival of Captain Richard Morris in New York, Anthony Morris (b. at Stepney, London, England) settled in Philadelphia. He was the founder of the very reputable Morris Family of that city, to which one of the most extended of recent American genealogies is devoted. ("The Morris Family of Philadelphia," by Richard C. Moon, M.D. Three volumes. 1898.) This Anthony Morris was the son of Anthony Morris, who is described as a mariner, and who was engaged in the trade with Barbadoes, apparently about the same time that the brothers Lewis and Richard were resident there. Another coincidence is that Anthony the son was a Quaker, as was Colonel Lewis Morris of Barbadoes.

Robert Morris, the "Financier of the Revolution," was not a member either of the Morrisania family or (though a citizen of Philadelphia) of the Anthony Morris family; he was b. in Liverpool, and came to this country about 1747.

Several other Morris families, of varying foreign antecedents, appeared in America—some in New England and some in the south—during colonial times.

cestry of Captain Richard Morris is a manuscript history of the family, compiled in the eighteenth century by Valentine Morris of England (a descendant of an elder brother of Captain Richard), from which copious citations are made in Bolton's "History of Westchester County" (2d ed., vol. ii., p. 455).

According to this authority, the family lineage is traceable to "*Rys*, sometimes called Rice Fitzgerald, brother to Rys, Prince of Geventland, which Rys or Rice Fitzgerald was settled in Monmouthshire." In the year 1171, in conjunction with Richard Strongbow, Earl of Striquil and Pembroke, he led an invading expedition into Ireland, and soon subjugated the larger part of that country. In this enterprise the two associates were encouraged by Henry II. of England, who, however, appropriated their conquests. "For his warlike achievements Rys, the companion of Strongbow, was for pre-eminence called *Maur Rys* or *Maur Rice*, i. e., the great Rys or Rice. The word mawr or maur in Welsh signifying great, and his descendants dropping the name of Fitzgerald for this, ever after thought it an honor to retain that addition, and thus the name became *Mawr Rys* or *Maurise*, and finally Morris."² The name Rys or Rhys is a frequent one in early Welsh history. About the same time as that noted above lived the celebrated Rhys (son of Gryffydd ap Rhys), who inherited the sovereign dignity in South Wales, and whose disputes, struggles, and compromises with Henry II. of England constitute an important part of the history of the two countries.³

In the first half of the seventeenth century *William Morris*, of the line of Rys Fitzgerald or Maur Rys, was resident in Monmouthshire on an estate called Tintern, situated near

² Morris (Welsh); from Mawr and rys, a hero, a warrior, a brave man.—"Arthur's Etymological Dictionary of Family and Christian Names."

³ Warrington's "History of Wales," vol. i., p. 480.

the historic Tintern Abbey.⁴ To him four sons were born, Lewis, William, Thomas, and *Richard*, all of whom became active partisans in the parliamentary cause, and brave and distinguished officers in the Cromwellian armies.

COLONEL LEWIS MORRIS, the eldest of the brothers, inherited the paternal estate of Tintern. Appointed to the command of a troop of horse in the Civil War, he acquitted himself with conspicuous credit in that service. At the siege of Chepstow Castle (1648), on the English border of Monmouthshire—one of the most notable episodes in that conflict,—he was second in command. After a long resistance the place was taken by cutting off its water supply and setting it afire; and it was in memory of this achievement that the present crest and motto of the family were added to its arms.⁵

In consequence of his participation in the cause of the parliament, his estates were confiscated by Charles I. during the rebellion, but subsequently he received indemnification from Cromwell.

In early life Colonel Morris became attracted by the West Indies, having made a voyage thither in 1633 in the service of the New Providence Company. After the triumph of Cromwell he removed to the Island of Barbadoes, where he bought a magnificent estate. At that period Barbadoes was in a highly flourishing condition, inhabited by wealthy gentlemen of the best families of England, who owned great sugar plantations and were engaged in the rich trade which centered in its ports. Colonel Morris at once became one of the leading citizens; was appointed a member of the council; in 1654 was

⁴ "The Abbey," says Baedeker ("Guide to Great Britain," ed. 1890, p. 176), "was founded by Cistercian monks in 1131, but the church, the chief feature of the ruins, dates from the end of the following century. The building, which is 228 feet long, is a fine specimen of decorated Gothic. The roof and central tower are gone, but the rest of the structure is still well preserved. The window tracery and other decorations are very beautiful."

⁵ Arms—Quarterly, 1 and 4, gules, a lion rampant regardant or; 2 and 3, argent, three torteaux. Crest—A castle in flames, proper. Motto—"Tandem vincitur" (He conquered at last).

an officer in the expedition against the Spanish colonies, being present at the reduction of Jamaica, and in 1663 was concerned in the purchase of Santa Lucia. A man of very positive mind and strong religious temperament, he became a convert to the doctrines of the Quakers and was on terms of close personal intimacy with George Fox, the founder of that sect (whom he entertained during his visit to Barbadoes), and also with William Penn, the celebrated proprietary of Pennsylvania.⁶ For contumacity in refusing to pay church dues and minister's money, and to furnish men and horses for the militia, he was on one occasion fined 16,193 pounds of sugar.

He was interested with his brother Richard in the purchase of Bronxland in the Province of New York (1670), whither he removed after the latter's untimely death, assuming the proprietorship of the estate and the care and education of its orphan heir, the young Lewis Morris. As already noticed, he greatly enlarged the property, and also became an extensive owner of lands in New Jersey. Although not active in public affairs, he was an honored citizen of New York, sustaining relations of intimacy with the foremost men of his times. He died in 1691. His personal estate (exclusive of the value of the lands) was appraised at nearly £5,000.

Colonel Morris was twice married, but left no male issue. According to the family history quoted by Bolton, he had a

⁶In his will Colonel Morris made the following provision: "I give and bequeathe unto my honored friend, William Penn, my negro man Yaff, provided said Penn shall come to dwell in America." Several years later Penn, being then a resident of Philadelphia, referred to this bequest at a meeting of Friends, spoke of his long and familiar acquaintance with Morris, and, in alluding to the gift of the slave, made the following comment, quite remarkable for those times: "As I am now fairly established here in America, I may readily obtain the servant by mentioning the affair to my young friend, Lewis Morris; although a concern hath laid upon my mind for some time regarding the negroes, and I almost determined to give my own blacks their freedom. For I feel that the poor captured Africans, like other human beings, have natural rights, which cannot be withheld from them without great injustice."

daughter who married John Walters of Piercefield, two miles west of Chepstow, Monmouthshire.⁷

WILLIAM MORRIS, second son of William Morris of Tintern, and brother of the preceding, received for his portion the fine property of Denham in Wales. He too was an officer under the parliament in the Civil War. He died at sea. ⁷

William Morris had a son, Captain John Morris, also a Cromwellian soldier, who purchased lands in the West Indies, reared a family there, and, like his father, was lost at sea (1688). From him descended Morrisises resident on the islands of Barbadoes, Antigua, etc. One of his grandsons, Valentine Morris (son of John Morris of Antigua and Grizzle Wallace), returned to England, where he became lieutenant-colonel in the regular army and married, 1st, Elizabeth Keynell, daughter and heiress of Sir Christopher Keynell, and 2d, Elizabeth Wilmot. It was this Colonel Valentine Morris who in the eighteenth century purchased the estate of Piercefield in Monmouthshire. His youngest son was Valentine Morris (born 1727), the compiler of the MS. history of the family.

I.

CAPTAIN RICHARD MORRIS, fourth son of William Morris of Tintern, was born on the paternal estate in Monmouthshire, Wales. Like all his family he supported the cause of parliament in the issues with the king, and, entering the military service, was attached to the regiment commanded by his brother Lewis, rising to the rank of captain. After the Stuart restoration he followed Lewis to Barbadoes, where he married Sarah Pole, a wealthy lady.

Apparently preferring a more temperate climate, Richard decided to remove to the Province of New York, which had

⁷This property, says the same authority, was sold in 1739 to Colonel Valentine Morris, father of Valentine Morris, the family historian. The latter inherited it, and by liberal expenditures and with fine taste brought it to a high state of improvement.

recently been wrested by the English from the Dutch, and offered the advantages of a fine situation and a tolerably substantial measure of settlement. In taking this step it was his object to establish himself on a landed estate, to which end he received the co-operation of Lewis. The brothers entered into articles of agreement, stipulating that they should share jointly in the resulting purchase, and that "if either of them should die without issue, the survivor, or issue of that survivor, if any, should take the estate."

Captain Richard Morris accordingly repaired to New York, and on August 10, 1670, in his own name—styling himself "a merchant of New York,"—and that of Colonel Lewis Morris, "a merchant of Barbadoes," purchased from Samuel Edsall "a certaine tract or parcel of land formerly in the tenure of Jonas Bronck's, commonly called by the Indians by the name of Ranackque, and by the English Bronck's land, lying and being on the maine to the east and over against Harlem town," and containing "about five hundred acres or two hundred and fifty margon." Here he died in the autumn of 1672, the sad event being announced to Colonel Lewis Morris in a letter from Mathias Nicoll, secretary of the Province of New York, dated on October 29 of that year.

Married, as above noted, Sarah Pole, of Barbadoes. She died at about the same time as her husband.

Issue :

1. *Lewis Morris*; of whom below.

II.

LEWIS MORRIS, only child of Captain Richard and Sarah (Pole) Morris, was born on the Bronxland estate, October 15, 1671. Losing both his parents in his infancy, he was reared



and educated under the care of his uncle, Colonel Lewis Morris, who, selling his possessions in Barbadoes, removed to New York. The old parliamentary and Quaker, cherishing rigid notions of life, brought up his nephew accordingly. It appears that the lad failed to conform exactly to this strict discipline, suffered his uncle's displeasure in consequence, and, in an impatient moment, left home. After somewhat

extensive travels (during which he sustained himself as a scrivener) he returned and was reconciled. The intractable disposition of the youth, which led to the unfortunate rupture, is adverted to in words of some severity in the uncle's will, which have been often quoted.⁸

⁸All the early Morrises were men of positive character, and accustomed to record their sentiments in emphatic writing, as several other wills besides the one above referred to bear witness. Lewis Morris the nephew in turn left a will illustrating this family trait; in which he directed that he should be buried in a plain coffin, that no rings or scarfs should be given at the funeral, that no man should be paid for preaching a sermon over the body (although any clergyman so minded might voluntarily speak what he thought), and that no mourning dresses should be worn, as he

Succeeding to the estate at the death of his uncle in 1691, he entered upon his career with every advantage of distinguished birth, refined breeding, and abundant fortune; a personal position which was given still further consequence by his marriage, the same year, into one of the principal families of the province. His inheritance included the Bronxland property—which had been increased by his uncle from the original five hundred to nineteen hundred and twenty acres,—and some thirty-five hundred acres in the present county of Monmouth, N. J., with other New Jersey lands.

At that period it was the policy of the British government to confer special privileges of a semi-aristocratic nature upon certain American families which were sufficiently qualified for such pre-eminence by social position and landed possessions. No titles of nobility were granted, but family estates were formally erected by letters patent into manors, upon the aristocratic English plan. Among the families thus honored were the Van Rensselaers and Livingstons on the upper Hudson, and a number on Long Island and in Westchester county.⁹

On the 8th day of May, 1697, Lewis Morris received from Governor Fletcher a patent converting his Bronxland estate into the "Lordship or Manor of Morrisania," and bestowing upon him and his successors authority to hold a court leet

was unwilling that his friends should be put to such unnecessary expense, which was "owing only to the common folly of mankind." And the next Lewis Morris (son of Lewis the nephew) made the following stipulation in his will: "It is my wish that my son Gouverneur shall have the best education that can be furnished him in England or America, but my express will and directions are that under no circumstances shall he be sent to the Colony of Connecticut for that purpose, lest in his youth he should imbibe that low craft and cunning so incident to the people of that country, and which are so interwoven in their constitution that they cannot conceal it from the world, although many of them, under the sanctified garb of religion, have attempted to impose themselves upon the world as honest men."

⁹The Westchester County manors were Pelham, patented to Thomas Pell; Fordham, to John Archer; Philipseburgh, to Frederick Philipse; Morrisania, to Lewis Morris; Van Cortlandt, to Stephanus Van Cortlandt, and Scarsdale, to Caleb Heathcote.

and court baron, to exercise jurisdiction over all waifs, estrays, wrecks, deodands, goods, or felons happening and being within the manor limits, and to enjoy the advowson and right of patronage over all churches in the manor. The dignity of "lord of the manor" was enjoyed by himself, by his eldest son, Lewis Morris, and by the latter's eldest son, Lewis Morris the Signer; finally, with the manorial privilege itself, disappearing in the Revolution. The law of primogeniture did not, however, apply to the property. The estate of Morrisania descended intact in the family—undergoing various subdivisions in later generations, but with few alienations of the land to strangers,—until toward the middle of the nineteenth century.¹⁰

Morrisania did not, however, monopolize the attention of its proprietor; and indeed throughout his early manhood he appears to have had a preference for residence on his New Jersey lands, and in that province his distinguished career began. The large New Jersey purchase of the elder Lewis Morris was called Monmouthshire (whence Monmouth County)¹¹; and a portion of it received the name of Tintern in memory of the old Morris home in Wales. On this property the first iron mine in the colonies was worked as early as 1675.¹²

In 1692, at the age of twenty-one, Morris was appointed judge of the court of common right in New Jersey, also be-

¹⁰ After the extension of the Harlem Railroad into Westchester County (1841) the importance of this section became appreciated, its lands were purchased by judicious homeseekers and investors, population increased, and progress was steadily made toward urban conditions. The whole of the original Morrisania Manor, with the adjacent portions of Westchester County, was annexed to the City of New York in 1874, and now constitutes a part of the Borough of the Bronx of the metropolis. Members of the Morris Family still continue as large property owners in the city territory which embraces the ancestral domain.

¹¹ Morris County, N. J., and the village of Morristown, were so called in honor of Lewis Morris the nephew, who became the first governor of the province after its separation from New York.

¹² "Civil and Judicial History of New Jersey," p. 234.

coming a member of the council of Governor Hamilton. From this time until his death he was continuously identified with public affairs. A native-born American, inheriting bold and aggressive principles from his ancestors, he early manifested a strong inclination to popular rights and interests and a particular antagonism to the purely arbitrary and personal course which characterized the administrations of most of the royal governors. The circumstances of the times peculiarly called for leaders of such conscientious and inflexible character, and Morris soon became the recognized head of the popular side.

He was a prominent member of the party which refused to recognize the authority of Governor Basse (1698), and was in consequence expelled from the council and fined for contempt. Returning to the council upon the reappointment of Hamilton as governor of New Jersey by the proprietors in 1700, he was from that time forward active in political affairs. He was one of the strongest advocates of the surrender of the New Jersey proprietary government to the crown in the interest of reforms, and in behalf of this measure went to England and secured its adoption. While there he was offered the governorship of the province; an offer which was withdrawn when it was decided to consolidate the administration of New Jersey with that of New York under the notorious Lord Cornbury. He became a member of Cornbury's council in 1703, but in that position, as an honest and fearless public servant, made himself personally so unacceptable to the corrupt governor that he was dismissed the next year. Reinstated by the order of the queen, he persevered in the same course of uncompromising opposition to all tyrannical and unworthy official acts, and was again and permanently dismissed by Cornbury. But while excluded from the inner councils of the government, Morris still had the resources of popular opposition, and these he used with powerful effect as a member of the New Jersey assembly. He was



CORNBURY IN FEMALE ATTIRE

the author of the celebrated paper on Cornbury's administration — one of the ablest political documents of the times,—which, with resolutions passed by the assembly, was sent to England and resulted in the governor's recall and disgrace (1708). Under the next two executives, Lovelace and Ingoldsby, he again sat in the council; but Ingoldsby (also a mean and despotic character) found him a no more congenial associate than had Cornbury, and sought the

same remedy of suspension. This, however, was only a passing episode, for Ingoldsby, after a few brief months of power, was removed, being succeeded by Governor Robert Hunter (1710).

It was at this period that Morris, after twenty years of connection with the Province of New Jersey, changed the scene of his political activity, and entered upon his memorable career in New York. In 1710 he was elected a deputy to the New York assembly from the borough town of Westchester, whose jurisdiction comprehended his estate of Morrisania. Of all the members of that body, says Smith, the colonial historian of New York, "Morris had the greatest influence on our public affairs. He was a man of letters, and though a little whimsical in his temper, was grave in his manners and of penetrating parts. Being excessively fond of men of sense and reading, he was never wearied at a sitting till the spirits of the whole company were dissipated." With Governor Hunter he established from the beginning the most cordial

and intimate relations. Hunter had risen by merit from a comparatively lowly station in life, had accomplished tastes in literature and for the refinements of intellect, and possessed a marked worth of private character. It was for him that Mr. Morris named his younger son, Robert Hunter Morris (afterward governor of Pennsylvania).

Appointed to the presidency of the council by the new governor, Morris now, from an attitude of opposition which had seemed quite chronic, became the constituted chief of the administration, in which capacity he performed his part with his accustomed energy and positiveness. He warmly sustained the governor in his controversies with the assembly, going to such lengths that on one occasion, "for violent language in the course of debate," he suffered expulsion from membership; although he was promptly returned to his seat by his constituents. On the 13th of March, 1715, he was appointed to the office of chief-justice of New York,¹³ to whose functions the next eighteen years of his life were devoted. Meanwhile, until 1728, he continued to serve in the assembly.

Throughout the administration of Hunter and his two successors, Burnet and Montgomerie, Morris led a career of dignified authority at the head of the judicial system of the province, uninterrupted by any serious matters of issue. Montgomerie died suddenly in New York in July, 1731, and it was more than a year before the next appointed governor, Cosby, arrived from England. In the interim the duties of governor of New York were discharged, as legally provided, by the president of the council, Rip Van Dam, who during his incumbency duly drew the salary attaching to the office. Cosby, upon reaching New York, was greatly incensed in

¹³ Governor Hunter, in announcing this appointment to the lords of trade, wrote: "Mr. Mompesson, our chief-justice, is dead. I have commissioned Lewis Morris, Esqr., in his room for these reasons among others, that he is a sensible honest man, & able to live without a salary, which they will certainly never grant to any man in that station, at least sufficient to maintain his clerk."

consequence, and demanded that Van Dam surrender to him half the amount appropriated, which the latter refused to do except on condition that the governor would in turn release half the fees and perquisites (aggregating a still larger sum) that had been paid him in England in the same period. From this curious situation resulted great events.

Bringing suit against Van Dam in the salary matter, Cosby was unwilling to leave the case to the processes of the existing courts, and caused his council to arbitrarily erect a court of chancery as a special tribunal for its determination—a proceeding which gave great offense to popular sentiment as an unwarranted exercise of the official prerogative. With some misgivings, but having no alternative except to himself sit as ex-officio chancellor, he placed Chief-Justice Morris at its head. The latter, upon the assembling of the court, immediately sustained the contention of the opposing counsel, that the tribunal was of irregular and illegal creation; and the whole action thus fell to the ground.

A bitter feud against Morris was now instituted by the enraged governor and his partisans. He addressed to him a discourteous letter, which included personal reflections and innuendoes. To this the chief-justice replied with great dignity on the essential point involved—his sworn duty to administer the law without favor, and also without fear of executive intimidation; and, touching personal allusions, with moderation but simple nobility of language.¹⁴ Cosby,

"If," he wrote, "a bow awkwardly made, or anything of that kind, or some defect of ceremonial in addressing you, has occasioned that remark [in the governor's letter], I beg it may be attributed to want of courtly education, or to anything else rather than to want of respect to his majesty's representative. As to my integrity, I have given you no occasion to call it in question. I have been in office almost twenty years. My hands were never soiled with a bribe, nor am I conscious to myself that power or poverty hath been able to induce me to be partial in favor of either of them; and as I have no reason to expect any favor from you, so I am neither afraid nor ashamed to stand the test of the strictest inquiry you can make concerning my conduct. I have served the public faithfully and honestly, according to the best of my knowledge, and I dare and do appeal to it for my justification."

without further ceremony, thereupon removed him from office (August 21, 1733).

Intense popular indignation followed this vindictive act. The only practicable remedy possible being an expression of the public feeling in some formal way, one of the assembly members from Westchester County, William Willet, resigned his seat, and, an election being ordered to fill the vacancy, Morris stood as the candidate of the opposition. The election, held at the town of Eastchester on the 29th of October, 1733, resulted in a complete victory for Morris; a result which was received with wild enthusiasm throughout the colony, especially in New York City, where bells were rung, guns were fired, and the triumphant ex-chief-justice was greeted as a hero by the populace and feted by the principal citizens.

Among the spectators attracted to the Eastchester election by the importance and interest of the occasion was a young printer from the city, John Peter Zenger. Ardent in the great

popular cause, and stimulated by the scenes that he witnessed, he wrote an extended account of the event, which a week later he published in the first number of his famous *New York Weekly Journal*, a newspaper launched expressly in opposition to the government, and to give utterance to the profound feelings of the times. Its appearance was welcomed by all persons of liberal minds, and such men as Morris, James Alexander, and William Smith became its contributors. The columns of the *Journal* were filled with radical



and weighty discussions of the principles of government,

merciless satires directed against the governor and his "court," and kindred effusions of a boldness unprecedented in America. For a long time Cosby tried by every means within his power to suppress the paper and punish its publisher, but the grand jury uniformly refused to find an indictment, and the assembly, to which he also appealed, was equally obdurate. Finally, however, Zenger was arrested on an information for libel and brought to trial. The jury immediately returned a verdict of acquittal, to the immense delight of the whole country.

The Zenger case was undoubtedly the most notable, for the issues involved, ever tried in the colonies, establishing for the first time the great doctrine of liberty of the press—with which no royal governor again ventured to interfere,—and, as thoughtful historians have observed, initiating in surprising development, forty years in advance of the Revolution, some of the foundation principles of human rights and political freedom upon which that conflict was fought.¹⁵ It was the logical and direct sequence of the patriotic attitude of Chief-Justice Morris in resisting an arbitrary executive; and throughout the controversy he was one of the most steadfast and influential promoters of the cause of the people.

Returned to the New York assembly, as we have seen, in 1733, he took the leadership of the opposition forces, and, it being decided to dispatch an agent to England to inform the home government of the state of affairs, was selected for the mission (1734). He was received and treated with favor, but the government was not disposed to go to the length desired, of Cosby's removal. On the other hand, the circumstances of Morris's deposition from the chief-justiceship were reviewed and pronounced insufficient. On his return to America his popularity was undiminished, and he continued to perform a leading part in legislative transactions until

¹⁵ The Zenger case was declared by Gouverneur Morris to be "the germ of the Revolution."

1738, when he was appointed governor of New Jersey—the first to occupy the position after the detachment of that province from New York, a measure which was secured mainly through his labors and influence.

In the governorship of New Jersey the remainder of his life was spent. Entering upon its duties at the age of sixty-six, he discharged them with no abatement either of intellectual faculties or the great industry and energy which had always characterized him. A man of very rigid natural qualities and traits, of dictatorial temperament, accustomed all his life to the control and direction of men and measures, and possessing fixed opinions on fundamental subjects, it is not surprising that his administration of a young and restless province, newly setting up in government for itself, and impatient of old forms and conditions, was troubled with many dissensions and jars. Like the governors of New York, he now in his turn had difficulties with refractory assemblies, which revengefully withheld supplies and salary. It is the familiar record of rivalry and contention between executive and legislature left by most colonial administrations, and quite inseparable from a loosely organized system of government, with no formalized constitutional limitations. Yet in all substantial respects his administration was productive of great benefits to the province. Under the uncle the first manufacturing industry in New Jersey was begun, and the nephew was throughout his life earnest in favoring development on manufacturing lines, which, indeed, took considerable strides—especially in iron production—about the middle of the eighteenth century. He also did much to promote agricultural interests and the means of communication. "He was one of the creators of the council of colonial governors, which devised plans of offense and defense against the French and Indians, and kept a courier service between his colony, Pennsylvania, New York, and Connecticut. New Jersey was poor, compared with New York, and to prevent increasing the

burden of the taxpayers the big-hearted governor defrayed all these expenses."

Governor Morris died at his country seat, "Kingsbury," near Trenton, N. J., May 21, 1746. As directed in his will, he was buried with simple ceremonies in the family vault at Morrisania. The funeral was the occasion of a remarkable demonstration of respect and honor, participated in by the men of principal prominence and consideration in the two provinces, and citizens from every class of the population.

Concerning the private character of Governor Morris, all his contemporaries speak in terms of encomium and admiration. In an age distinguished by haughty pretensions on the part of the English governing class and a spirit of convenient complaisance to this class on the part of most men cherishing political aspirations, his course was shaped by manly independence and courageous principle. He never sought or accepted preferment involving discreditable or questionable associations; much of his life is a record of antagonism to odious governors, for which he suffered dismissal after dismissal from office; and both his appointment as president of the council and elevation to the chief-justice-ship belong to a gubernatorial regime which is pronounced by all historians as one of the most honest and worthy in the colonial history of New York. His peculiarities of temperament have been much commented on, but as mere idiosyncrasies—not as blemishes—in a character of unchallengeable integrity, sustained by great abilities and adorned by eminent personal virtues and accomplishments.

He was one of the active members of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and was an early benefactor of Trinity Church in New York, to whose erection he contributed and in which he served as vestryman.

Married, November 3, 1691, Isabella Graham, daughter of Hon. James Graham, attorney-general of New York and a descendant of the Grahams "of the Isles," of the same family

as the Earls of Montrose. His wife, says Smith in his entertaining "History of New York," was "a fine lady, with whom he lived above fifty years, in the possession of every enjoyment which good sense and polite manners in a woman could afford." She died April 6, 1752.

Issue:

Lewis Morris, of whom below.

Robert Hunter Morris, b. about 1700, d. at Shrewsbury, N. J., January 27, 1764. He inherited his father's lands in New Jersey, and his career was identified with that province and Pennsylvania. In 1738 he was appointed a member of the New Jersey council by his father, the governor, also becoming chief-justice. He served as governor of Pennsylvania from October 3, 1754, to August 20, 1756, meantime retaining his commission as chief-justice of New Jersey, in which latter position he continued until his death. Possessing marked abilities and agreeable personal qualities, he associated on friendly terms with the principal men of his times. Benjamin Franklin says of him that he was "eloquent and an acute sophist, and therefore generally successful in argumentative conversation. He had been brought up to it from a boy, his father, as I have heard, accustoming his children to dispute with one another for his diversion while talking at the table after dinner." Unmarried.

Mary Morris. M. Captain Vincent Pearse.

Euphemia Morris. M. Captain Matthew Morris, son of Sir John Morris.

Anna Morris. M. Edward Antill of Ross Hill, Raritan, N. J.

Arabella Morris. M. James Graham.

Margaret Morris, M. Isaac Willets.

Elizabeth Morris. M. Colonel Anthony White.

Sarah Morris. M. Michael Kearny.

Isabella Morris. M. Richard Ashfield.

John Morris.

Child, d. young.

To be continued.

THE FUR TRADE IN THE EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTHWEST.

BY HENRY M. UTLEY.

IT did not take the men who came over to New France long to discover the commercial possibilities of the fur business. The Spaniard and the Portuguese were infatuated by the prospect of unearthing gold and precious gems. The Frenchman and the Englishman found vastly greater wealth in the humble wild animals which roamed the primitive forests. These had for the most part been left free to multiply in a state of nature. The modest wants of the red man in the way of food and clothing were easily met. Beyond these he did not care to go and never killed for the sake of killing, except when it came to his own species.

The animals of North America produced the finest furs in the world. The climate of the northernmost sections was adapted to the growth and development of these animals under the most perfect conditions. The beaver, silver fox, red fox, wolverine, fisher, mink, otter, lynx, black bear, wolf, and others were found in vast numbers. Their skins had ready sale in all the centers of wealth and fashion, the world over. They were used for muffs, boas, capes, robes, trimmings, etc., and many a noble princess was proud to adorn her person with the furs brought over seas from the far interior of America. We can little appreciate in these days, when so many interests of large importance enter into the commercial affairs of the world, how great was the single traffic in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It occupied the attention and the capital of men of means and influence. Companies were formed to exploit the trade, and

ultimately these accumulated enormous wealth, exercised imperial authority over extended territory, and controlled the means of subsistence and the destinies of great numbers of people.

In its infancy the traffic in furs in the northwest was confined to the few adventurers who came over with Gartier, Roberval, Champlain, and the early explorers. These saw the beauty and the value of the furs, and knowing well that they were readily marketable in the old world stimulated the Indians to bring them in from the forests. The natives had no conception whatever of their intrinsic value, and parted with them for a handful of glass beads of assorted colors. Trinkets of no worth whatever, and which cost their owners little beyond freight to this country, answered every purpose for exchange. Powder and shot, brandy and rum, were quoted high in the barter. The profits of this business soon came to the ears of the people in France, and great numbers of young men set out to make their fortunes in the new world. These were adventurous spirits who had little if anything to tie them to their old homes. Arriving in America, they did not wait for the Indians to bring in the peltries, but plunged boldly into the forests to dicker with the native at close range. Thousands of such in the course of years swarmed through the woods or paddled their canoes through the lakes and streams. They learned the Indian's language, they adopted his mode of life. They married squaws and reared innumerable progeny. They shared the life of the native in all respects, except that they did not join in the war raids, but gave their undivided attention to hunting and marketing their peltries. These were the *coureurs de bois*, or wood rangers. They became, to all intents and purposes, more Indian than white man. They were of a happy-go-lucky disposition, entirely beyond the restraints of civilization, with morals somewhat below par and an unquenchable thirst for strong drink.

La Houtan, writing from Montreal in 1684, says: "The merchants are the only persons that make money here; for the savages that frequent the great lakes come down hither almost every year with a prodigious quantity of beaver skins to be given in exchange for arms, kettles, axes, knives, and a thousand such things, upon which the merchant clears two hundred per cent. The pedlars, called the *coureurs de bois*, export from hence every year several canoes full of merchandise, which they dispose of among all the savage nations by way of exchange for beaver skins. Seven or eight days ago I saw twenty-five or thirty of these canoes return with heavy cargoes. Each canoe was managed by two or three men and carried twenty hundred weight, or forty packs, of beaver skins, worth a hundred crowns apiece. These canoes had been a year or eighteen months out. You would be amazed if you saw how lewd these pedlars are when they return; how they feast and game and how prodigal they are, not only in clothes but upon women. They lavish, eat, drink, and play all away as long as the goods hold out, and when these are gone they even sell their embroidery, their lace, and their clothes. This done, they are forced to go upon a new voyage for subsistence." The same writer describes the arrival of the savages with cargoes of furs, which they exchange with the merchants for such articles as enumerated above. It is a sort of fair, in which the savages are ceremoniously received by the governor-general, after which they display the products of the chase and traffic with the merchants. He relates the restrictions placed upon the sale of liquor to the savages, which restrictions are by no means observed. When drunk the Indians were quarrelsome and dangerous, not only among themselves, but were also a terror to the town.

When it was first discovered that there was abundance of peltries which had a marketable value, the savages thus brought them to the town to be disposed of. Later the *coureur de bois* scoured the wilderness and bartered with the savages

at their various points of rendezvous. The savages had no appreciation of the value of the skins which they bartered. They gladly exchanged them for the glittering trinkets, which they thought of enormous worth. Thus the Indian was cheated outrageously, though he believed himself getting the best of the bargain. Each party to the transaction had supreme contempt for the other, because he considered that which he was parting with of only trifling worth, while that which he was getting in exchange of exceedingly great value. When it became known that there were such enormous profits in the business, the authorities sought to control and restrict it by imposing regulations which diverted a part of the profits to the officials at the head of affairs. This took the form of a license, without which no one was permitted to engage in the trade. These licenses in printed form were granted to gentlemen of political influence, retired officers, or their widows. In the case of the last mentioned, who could not personally make use of them, they were permitted to sell the license. The merchants were the purchasers, and they, in turn, employed the *coureurs de bois* in the quality of agents. So there came to be traffic in licenses, as well as in furs. The officials issuing the licenses and the holders of the same all the way down the line shared in the profits of the transaction, and so the matter soon became little short of scandalous.

The number of licenses granted in any one year was supposed to be limited to twenty-five, but as a matter of fact there was no limit, and private licenses were issued equal to the full demand. All persons were forbidden to engage in the traffic without a license, under penalty of death. The price of a license was six hundred crowns, and it permitted the lading of two canoes only with supplies for barter. The operations were practically in the hands of the *coureurs de bois*, and these gentry showed no conscience in their dealings with the savages, but cheated them outrageously. Their two canoe-loads of trinkets bought four or five canoe-loads of

beaver skins, and the profits were distributed in such way as to satisfy all, the merchant who had supplied the capital taking, of course, the lion's share. There was also much clandestine dealing in furs. Unauthorized persons were constantly going up and down the land, and when they saw a good opportunity for a bargain they did not let it slip through their fingers for lack of a royal commission. There were ways of covering up these illicit transactions, and it is more than hinted that persons high in authority had been known to wink at dealings that were somewhat shady.

The prices of beaver skins were fixed at the office of the farmers-general, the company of the hundred associates organized to handle the affairs of the colony. If the furs were sold at that office, the payment was in exchange upon Paris or Rochelle; if sold to a private dealer, payment was in the currency of the country, which was greatly depreciated. Here again was a source of profit for the middleman, who was ready to take advantage of the possessor of peltries who could not show a clear title to them.

There was a vast amount of intriguing, political and otherwise, which at bottom was chargeable to the fur traffic. The small jealousies and rivalries of officials of greater or less degree often had their source in the dealings with those concerned in the trade or the profits which came out of it into their private purses. Even the royal court at Versailles was not wholly free from the influence, and governors or commandants were sent out or recalled through the manipulations of the fur interests. As the importance of the matter came to be developed and to be better understood the atmosphere was cleared somewhat and a more satisfactory state of things resulted.

Military posts were established at Sault Ste. Marie, Michilimackinac, and at other points which were centers of the hunting industry and convenient of access from every direction. At these remote points the savages gathered at

certain seasons, as they had previously flocked to Quebec and Montreal, to sell the furs and buy their supplies of trinkets and tools, guns and powder, and last, but not least, to imbibe freely of brandy. The presence of a military force naturally exercised a restraining influence. The *coureurs de bois* were held in check, the good behavior of the savages was looked after, and illicit trading in furs was suppressed, so far as practicable. This trade had fallen into better hands. Able and respectable men, retired from the army, prosecuted the trade, either personally or through their licenses, and gave it character. It was also more systematically followed and extended and came to be recognized for the time as a most astonishing example of commercial enterprise.

It will be noted that the region of the great lakes was the source of supply from a very early day. The woods of Michigan was literally alive with animals whose furs were of the highest value in the market. Beavers were very abundant, and the beaver's fur was the choicest of all. Some of the most highly prized of the fur-bearing animals, such as the beaver, otter, fisher, mink, lived upon fish, and the lakes and streams of both peninsulas swarmed with their food supply. The fox, wolverine, lynx, and black bear in vast numbers roamed the forests. These facts account for the early establishment at Sault Ste. Marie and Michilimackinac of depots for the traffic in peltries. Those points were convenient of access from all directions, by canoe as well as overland. The latter was also the rallying point or headquarters for various expeditions fitted out for further westward exploration. It was called "The Key of the Northwest," and to it from every side adventurous travelers gathered; it was a great rendezvous. Long, who visited the country as recently as 1768 and wrote an account of his travels, says of Michilimackinac: "It is perhaps the most material of all the barriers, and of the greatest importance to the commercial interest of this country, as it intercepts all the trade of the Indians of the upper

country from Hudson's Bay to Lake Superior, and affords protection to various tribes of savages, who constantly resort to it to receive presents from the commanding officer, and from whence the traders who go to the northwest take their departure for the grand portage, or grand carrying place, before they enter on the waters communicating with the northwest."

The route of travel between Quebec, Montreal, and this westernmost post was by way of the Ottawa River, thence crossing over to Lake Nipissing and thence down French River to Lake Huron. A glance at the map will show that this is the shortest possible distance, being almost a direct line. Aside from this fact, it possessed several advantages, although it compelled a portage of some length. It was the ancient Indian route of travel from time immemorial. It avoided the numerous rapids and cascades of the St. Lawrence above Montreal, which Cartier had found so troublesome. It was wholly within the country of friendly tribes, and gave a wide berth to the bloodthirsty Iroquois who infested the shores of Lakes Ontario and Erie and the Niagara frontier. The Ottawa route involved many portages, that river being broken by numerous rapids. The long portage, so called, was from Lake Nipissing to the head tributaries of the Ottawa and was some five or six miles in length and extremely rough and rocky.¹ Algonquin villages were found at the terminals, and here labor could be employed for the carrying of burdens. In the primitive times this was the best that could be done. In spite of the inconvenience of it, a vast amount of business was done. All the traffic between Montreal and the upper lake region passed this way, as well as that originating in or destined for the uttermost regions of the sources of the Mississippi and the trading posts of Hudson's Bay.

¹ The grand portage was at the northwest of Lake Superior, from a point afterward known as Fort William, toward the Lake of the Woods.

EARLY NEW ENGLAND EXPLORATION OF OUR
NORTH PACIFIC COAST—THE
COLUMBIA RIVER.

BY HORACE S. LYMAN.

IN the following pages will be briefly described the first of what may be called the "stampedes" for the Pacific Coast. It was of small proportions compared with the others which followed; the much greater one of '49 to '53, to the gold fields of California, coming as the second. The first, however, although entirely by sea, was of very much the same character in its object and methods. It was commercial, with the object of making money and after acquiring a fortune to return home and enjoy it. Any political results or acquisition of territory or establishing of new commonwealths were at least secondary, if considered at all. Yet political and social results necessarily followed, and the benefit of the commercial enterprises went to the countries whose citizens engaged in the enterprises.

The Americans emerged from the Revolutionary War bitterly poor, both individually and nationally; but they had succeeded in throwing off the restrictions which had been laid upon industry, and were ready to begin an industrial era on as great a scale as their political ideas made possible. Even before the war the Massachusetts men, particularly of Nantucket, had engaged in sealing and whaling around Cape Horn. In this they had been encouraged by the British government, which was in constant dispute with Spain as to the rights of her subjects in the South Sea. The cod fisheries off Newfoundland had also engaged her people, and

at the north these two lines of enterprise were quickly resumed. In the forests of Maine was an almost inexhaustible store of pine, which waited only the skill of the mechanic to float on the seas to the ends of the earth. America was rich in shipbuilders and seamen, and it was an easy matter for any group of men, whether with or without capital, to form a company, build a ship, and follow the whale, or gather up the harvest of cod and mackerel. The hardihood and daring of the people of the young republic, who thus set out on voyages measured by thousands of miles and two or three years of time, while their wives kept alight the family fire and wove garments while watching at the window for their return, has seldom had a parallel. The necessity of the northerners to go outside of their own boundaries in order to get subsistence for their families and support a state, arose from the comparatively infertile character of the soil. At the south the same energy was displayed, but took the form of farming and planting. Tobacco was still the staple crop of the south, though Maryland, and to some extent Virginia, engaged in grain raising; Washington's flour business is well known. As the result of their seafaring, the men of the north coursed over the oceans and visited all shores; and as a result of their planting the men of the south, especially under the slave system, which brought about a division of the whites into the rich and the poor, became the mother of colonists, or "squatters"—the poor of the south learning to hate slavery and to seek, as they were able, little homes of their own in the mountains, and at the great west.

The northern men, with their ships, were the first to reach the coast of Oregon. Besides whaling, trading to China was undertaken. A ship, the "Empress of China," is said to have entered Canton in 1784—the first from New York, or any American port. By 1787 as many as five American vessels were in this trade—making the way by the Cape of Good

Hope. The captain of one of them, Reed, astonished the people of Canton by arriving while the northeast monsoon was still blowing; he had shown the daring of an old navigator by simply sailing east below Tasmania, until he could take the trade on his beam, and thus discovered a new sailing route.

But it was soon apparent to the American merchants that the route around Africa was not the most profitable; especially as in obtaining a cargo in China—consisting for the most part of tea, for which the Americans had become thirsty after the Revolutionary War—it was necessary to take out a large amount of ready money. For long voyages this was very uneconomical, and when the abundance of furs on the northwest coast became known, the point was at once seen. Instead of taking specie to China ships could be loaded with goods for Indian traffic—such as iron scrap and trinkets,—sail to Nootka, obtain a cargo of furs, sail to China, take on a cargo of teas, silks, and nankeens in exchange for the furs, and then return home by the Cape of Good Hope.

The following merchants became interested in the new enterprise—as stated by Rev. Edward C. Porter of Boston:—Joseph Barrel of Boston, a merchant of distinction; Charles Bullfinch, a recent graduate of Harvard; Samuel Brown, a merchant; John Derby, a shipmaster of Salem; Captain Crowell Hatch of Cambridge, and John Marden Pintard of the New York house of Lewis, Pintard and Company. Barrel and Bullfinch seem to have been the leading spirits of the enterprise, and it is said that they used to meet at the house of Dr. Bullfinch, father of Charles, in Bowdoin Square, and read together the account of Cook's voyage, published in 1784; and Barrel would always conclude, "Here is a rich harvest for those who go in first." While the book of Cook's voyage is mentioned it is hardly possible that Ledyard's account could have been overlooked; or it hardly seems that Ledyard himself could not have been seen by some


of these men as he went from port to port in 1783 looking for a ship. Probably like Deshon these careful men thought the adventurer was overdrawing and waited to see the official account.

The Boston company was formed; the "Columbia," a full-rigged ship of 212 tons burden, built by James Briggs at Hobart's Landing, near Scituate, was bought; being half man-of-war in construction, having two decks and mounting ten guns. Her full name was "Columbia Rediviva"—the last term indicating the patriotic feeling of the promoters that Columbia—America—was alive again. Their enterprise, indeed, was one of the best signs of this. As a consort the sloop "Washington"—"Lady Washington"—was purchased, being of but ninety tons burden. It is significant that now, after more than an hundred years, the names of these two Yankee ships should live on every tongue, one as the name of the great river, and the other as that of the great state.

As commander of the expedition Captain John Kendrick was selected; a man of forty-five, with a home at Wareham and family of six children. He had been an American patriot and commander of a privateer during the war. He took command of the "Columbia." As commander of the sloop was Robert Gray, an officer in the American navy during the Revolution, a native of Rhode Island, and a descendant of Plymouth colonists. He was unmarried until 1794; but marrying later left a family of five children. Other officers of this expedition were Simon Woodruff, Joseph Ingraham, Robert Haswell, and J. Nutting. Haswell was journalist of the voyage, and Nutting was astronomer or school-master, as commonly styled, who taught the seamen in nautical science as well as making calculations. The ship was well fitted out, supplied with scrap iron for native trade, and many medals of copper, bronze, and pewter, for distribution among the chiefs. A medallion was also struck, having the

names of the promoters on one side and a picture of the ships with Captain Kendrick's name on the other.

Sea letters were obtained from both the federal and state governments, and sail was set September 30, 1787. At the Cape Verde Islands a delay of two months occurred, and a black boy was taken aboard as roustabout, whose indiscretion afterwards caused great trouble. At the Falklands harbor was also made, and Kendrick was of a mind to remain over there until the next season, as so much time had been lost; but finally decided to let go. His apprehensions were realized, however, though not to a disas-



THE COLUMBIA MEDAL.

trous degree; violent storms were encountered, and the vessels were separated after passing Cape Horn, not to meet until both had made Nootka Sound. On August 2, 1788, the "Washington," under Gray, sighted Cape Mendocino, and here had a friendly greeting from Indians dressed in deer-skins, coming out in a canoe. In latitude 44 degrees they found "The entrance to a large river, where great commercial advantages might be reaped." This is the exact latitude of the Siuslaw; somewhat farther south is the Umpqua, which might perhaps be called a "large river" where it meets the ocean. That Gray should call either of these, however, "large" comes forth in great contrast to the assertions of Vancouver and Meares, the former coldly speaking of the

Columbia itself as insignificant or "a mere brook," and "unworthy of notice." But this, the first appreciative word of our Oregon coast as offering something worthy of attention, shows that a new sort of mind and a new man had been found. We are led to expect that something will be accomplished by him.

We shall see that the period of timidity was indeed past. Gray stood in toward every shore, and entered many harbors that the Spanish and English reported barred with solid lines of breakers, and found harbors where they saw nothing but a blank straight shore and unbroken mountain walls. At the river in 44 degrees the Americans had no friendly greeting. The Indians appeared and shook their spears. Sailing north they found near Cape Lookout a "tolerably commodious harbor." This was probably Netart's Bay, or perhaps Tillamook Bay. That they entered, and called the harbor anything comfortable at all, shows that at first sight the American explorers and merchants saw what has since been found entirely practicable, that more than half a dozen "tolerably commodious" harbors exist on the Oregon coast; some of them, such as Coos and Yaquina, have become respectable ports. It is safe to say that if no other harbors had been found the Americans could have done a fairly good business in Oregon. At this point they were treated at first very hospitably by the Indians, who brought them berries and boiled crabs, which were very much appreciated by the crew, now suffering somewhat from scurvy. But a bloody conflict was brought on by the carelessness of the colored boy, Marcos. A party was sent ashore to cut grass for the animals on board, and Marcos thoughtlessly left his saber sticking in the sand, which an Indian seeing coveted and attempted to take. Marcos tried to recover it, but was overpowered by many Indians and killed. The white men barely escaped to the ship, where Gray with but two others had remained aboard. Some of the Indians were shot. From such unfortu-

nate and heedless acts dates much of the hatred of the Indians. They were thieves, but usually if an article was stolen and redress asked of the chief, and a present given him, it would be returned. Many of the Americans, as well as the English, made everlasting enmities by treating theft as a high crime, and unmercifully punishing it without regard to the authority of the chiefs.

Passing the mouth of the Columbia at some distance, and not seeing it, Clioquot Sound was reached on August 16, and Nootka entered soon after. At the latter they were welcomed by the Englishmen, Meares and Douglas, who sent a boat out to meet the sail, supposing it an Englishman. The small schooner, the "Northwest America," was launched soon after by Meares and Douglas—which was afterward seized by the Spanish and used by them for two years. A week later Gray was rejoiced to see the "Columbia," with Kendrick, arriving; though she had suffered on the voyage, having been obliged to put into a port on the coast of Chili, and having lost three men by scurvy—with others sick of the same plague of the old sailor's life. By the Spanish commandant at Juan Fernandez, Gonzales, Kendrick was well treated, being supplied with all he needed; but Gonzales was removed by his government for harboring any but Spaniards in the South Sea. The same summer Martinez arrived in the corvette "Princessa"; he showed no ill-will to the Americans, but said that he would catch Douglas if he could find him.

The many interesting events of this first voyage, or Kendrick's explorations to the north and unhappy murder of his son; the settlement made and purchase of ground from Indians; and the return of the "Columbia," under Gray, to Boston, where she arrived in August, 1790, and was enthusiastically welcomed by the people, Governor Hancock himself coming to meet Gray and the young Sandwich Island chief, Attoo, who was dressed in glittering feather cloth, and the first of his race ever seen in Boston—can be only

alluded to here. Indeed the first voyage of the "Columbia" did not prove a financial success—the first great profits having been reaped by the Russians and English, and the Chinese market having become demoralized by the large offers made. But the people of Boston considered it a great event that the "Columbia" had sailed at all and returned in safety, and that the American flag, which stood for a new idea, had been carried around the world. The voyage of Kendrick in the "Washington" while Gray was returning to Boston, is stated by Meares to have been through the Straits of Fuca, thence northward, through an extensive sea, for eight degrees, and proving that the territory embracing Nootka Sound was an island; which, if so, shows with how much energy the Americans were learning geographical secrets that Spaniards had blundered over for many years, fearing to approach the shore.

It can only be noticed, also most briefly, that other Americans were preparing to enter the northwest coast trade. An American captain named Metcalf, arriving at Canton in 1789 in the brig "Eleanora," purchased there a schooner which he styled the "Fair American," and placing her under the command of his son, sailed for Nootka; was arrested, however, on his arrival by Martinez; but was released and allowed to sail for the Hawaiian Islands—where he was attacked himself by natives, and his son, at another harbor, was overcome and the schooner seized. The accounts show rashness and harshness on the part of both the captains; but the natives acted with all the ferocity of savages, being incited both by revenge for injuries and their thirst for the plunder—iron and brass being to them as valuable as so much silver and gold to whites.

Although not well satisfied with their venture, the owners of the "Columbia" fitted her out for a second voyage; but before she sailed the brig "Hope," under Joseph Ingraham, former mate of the "Columbia," set sail and was followed

by the "Hancock" and "Jefferson" from Boston, and the "Margaret" from New York. The voyage of Ingraham was distinguished by the discovery of a group of islands in the South Pacific, a little north of the Marquesas group, to which he gave patriotic American names—Washington, Adams, Franklin, Knox, Federal, and Lincoln. It may be hoped that in course of time it will come around so that these islands may come under the American flag with their old names. Touching at the Sandwich Islands, and sailing for the northwest coast, he arrived at Queen Charlotte's Island, called by the Americans Washington's Island, and speedily discovering a sound—it being no trick at all apparently for Americans to find inlets and harbors,—which he called Magee's Sound in honor of one of the owners of his vessel, and spent the summer trading and collecting information of the geography, resources, etc., of the country, which he inserted in his well-kept journal. These original names, too, should be remembered now that this island has come under our flag. Indeed, as one takes note of such early discoveries of Americans, one can hardly resist the conclusion that priority of exploration should have given the entire coast up to 54 degrees, 40 minutes, to the United States. America's claim by discovery was as good there as southward; but was not followed by occupation and settlement. It should be noticed, too, that the same spirit was shown by all the Americans; they dashed ahead, running onto every shore, entering every suspicion of an opening, and venturing into communication with every class and condition of human beings. This spirit has been well noticed by De Tocqueville, who describes the American traders and sailors as pursuing the business to the point of desperation, pressing both exploration and traffic to the last extremity.

Of the Americans that came to the northwest coast that season, however, the "Columbia," under Gray, carried off the prize. Sailing—on her second voyage—the 28th of Sep-

tember, 1790, she reached Clioquot Sound the 5th of June the next year, and spent the rest of the season in exploring northward to the east side of Queen Charlotte's Island. In one of the inlets, which was explored over one hundred miles, and thought by Gray to be the old river of the Kings of Fonte's narrative, he was attacked by natives and lost the mate and two sailors. He met Ingraham, and after comparing observations, the latter sailing for Canton, Gray returned to Clioquot and spent the winter. He built a post which he named Fort Defiance, a strong revolutionary term. Much of the time was spent in building a schooner, the "Adventure," and in making chisels from their scrap iron for trade with the natives. Nevertheless, although thus separated from home by almost a year's time, these New Englanders did not forget their principles, and every Sunday work was laid off and Gray held religious services. He also took a great interest in the Indians who were camped in the neighborhood; and as some of them were sick he was in the habit of visiting them, taking medicines and such delicacies as boiled rice and bread and molasses to them with his own hands. Hoskins, clerk of the expedition, also tells of persuading a young Indian woman to wash her face—which was, according to Indian custom, stained with paint, and what a revelation of beauty was the result; she had "a fair complexion of red and white, and one of the most delightful countenances I ever beheld," says the enthusiastic young man. But the white men's admiration proved less controlling over the Indian belle than the sneers of her own people, who speedily induced her to paint up again.

But these people were of the tribe which afterward wrought the destruction of the "Tonquin," and notwithstanding the kindness of Gray formed a conspiracy to capture his fort. They believed that they could persuade Attoo, the Hawaiian youth, to assist them, on promise of making him chief; and his part was to wet the powder of the Americans. But

though for a time inclined to favor the plan, he at length confessed all to Gray, who was ready to meet the Indians, and they finding this out suddenly retired from the attack they had planned.

On the arrival of the spring of 1792, Gray took the "Columbia" and explored southward. As related by Vancouver, Gray had been off the mouth of a river in latitude 46 degrees, 10 minutes—that of the Columbia,—trying for nine days to get in; and this port he wished now to see once more. Precisely when he was off the Columbia the nine days' time does not appear, but most probably when he came upon the coast the previous year. It was at six o'clock on Sunday morning, the 29th of April, near the Straits of Fuca, that he met Vancouver, and was told by the British officers that there was no entrance at Cape Disappointment; but he does not seem to have been deterred by this from making his own observations. On the seventh of May we find him proceeding down the coast and sighting an opening which he decided to try. This was in latitude 46 degrees, 58 minutes; about forty miles north of the Columbia. His temper and manner of procedure are shown here. At six miles from shore he saw an entrance which had the appearance of a good harbor. The jolly boat was sent ahead to sound and find anchorage, while the vessel stood back and forth, against a strong weather current. The boat returned at one, reporting no anchorage. Then, as Gray says laconically, "made sail on the ship and stood in shore. We soon saw from the masthead a passage between the sand bars. At half-past three bore in away, and ran in northeast by east, having four to eight fathoms, having a strong ebb tide to stem." One can easily imagine how the sand bars opened out, the entrance swung open like a gate, leaving abundant room between the breakers, as the man who dared venture approached. This has very properly been called Gray's Harbor, though it was named by

its discoverer Bullfinch's Harbor, in honor of the Harvard graduate and part owner of the vessel.

Here he remained until the 10th, many canoes coming alongside the ship, but no hostile disposition being reported. On the afternoon of that day, which was pleasant with a wind from the sea, the ship was unmoored, beat down the bay, and passed out, getting clear at seven. The object now was to enter the river below Cape Disappointment. No mention is made that the night was otherwise than calm; and "at the first light" all sails were set, and the course laid towards the desired port. At four o'clock in the morning this was seen east-southeast, six leagues off. Sail was brought to steering order, and the wind hauled inshore. The morning was undoubtedly fair, as the shore was easily seen nearly twenty miles away and the air light; as it was not until eight, or four hours' sail, before the harbor was reached. The intention was to run in, and there seems to have been no faltering. The breakers, which had seemed to Vancouver, Meares, Heceta, and later to the Russians, to close the entrance, were correctly seen by Gray to offer a wide channel between the two spits, and they guided his course so that he followed a channel with five to seven fathoms of water—thirty feet or over. The conditions were undoubtedly favorable, the morning clear, the wind light, the sea not high, and the channel as clearly indicated by its broad blue course between the tumbling breakers on the southwest, and those on the northwest, as if indicated by buoys. Yet the confidence with which Gray approached, and his quick perception of all these points, showed him to have had a full mastery of the situation, such as no other navigator had shown. Dr. Fiske does not think the entrance made by Gray in itself particularly remarkable. It was not, except comparatively; but considering that no other navigator had ever succeeded in crossing, and that he had himself been baffled nine days on his former attempt, and that he must feel his way as he advanced, it showed a

plucky and resolute spirit, and seamanlike handling of his vessel. All this showed a New World man, strongly contrasting with the Old World man, who approached the river and went away with only good excuses for not entering. The river itself seems to have owned the supremacy of the master captain, and the name bestowed by him, Columbia River, has been accepted and borne ever since. As pointed out by Dr. Fiske, three centuries after his own discovery of America, Columbus received the added honor of a name thus indirectly for him given to the greatest river of the Pacific Coast falling into the ocean.

After crossing the bar it was at once apparent that here was a large river of fresh water—completely disposing of the representation of Vancouver, that this was not the river, but simply an ocean bay, into which the river discharged more than twenty-five miles above. Dr. Fiske says, very justly as well as humorously, in his centennial address: "Considering the dogmatic assurance with which the British officers had maintained that there was no river there, until Gray furnished them with positive information, but for which Broughton would, in all probability, never have made his reconnaissance, there is a coolness about this argument that on a sultry day would be quite refreshing." Indeed, even at this late date, when the honor of discovery is acknowledged by all as belonging to the American, the claim of the British that they were the true discoverers of the river cannot but be resented as both untruthful and ungenerous. That Gray understood that the river carried its waters to the ocean is shown not only by his denominating it "a large river of fresh water," but by his immediately pumping out the salt water from his casks, and the next day filling up "all the water-casks in the hold"—which could not be done except by pumping in from the river.

The ship was at once greeted by natives in canoes, and when she came to anchor a little above the Chinook village

"vast numbers came alongside." There is no indication that they were otherwise than friendly and courteous. The next day the ship set sail and moved up stream a little, but a south-east wind coming on with rain and "dirty weather" she soon came to anchor. The rain with fresh gales continued the next day, but on the 14th, the sea breeze rising aft, the ship was unmoored and stood up the north channel about fifteen miles—probably not so far in a direct course, finally coming aground near what is now undoubtedly known as Gray's Bay. As Gray surmised, he had taken the wrong channel—the true course from Chinook being southeast to Tongue Point. After making observations on the shore, trading—no doubt—with the natives that still swarmed alongside, and giving the name Columbia to the river, Hancock to the cape on the north side, and Adams to that on the south, Gray stood down toward the bar, attempting a crossing on the 19th, but wind failing delayed until the next day, when he beat out against the tide—altogether the most seamanlike course—on the 20th.

Thus was discovered the Columbia River at last, the navigator finally appearing who at once perceived its true character and to whom its complex sands and currents were plain from the moment he looked at the surface. Between the long Clatsop spit on the south, and Peacock spit on the north, which stood farther out and seemed to overlap, he readily saw a broad passageway between the breakers, and followed it to his "desired port."

In the season of 1791-2 there were many vessels on the northwest coast, Fiske stating the number as high as thirty. To these, through Gray's information of his discovery to both Ingraham and Vancouver, whom he again saw at Nootka, the existence of the Columbia became known, and the river was then frequented by fur traders. In the autumn Broughton found an American vessel, the "Jenny," of Bristol, anchored within Cape Disappointment, and the name of

the captain, Baker, was bestowed upon the bay. The claim of the Americans was fully made known, and was finally recognized in right as well as in history, to give title to Oregon on the part of the United States—supplemented by subsequent use and occupation.

From this time, 1792, for about twenty years, the Americans held the trade in furs from the northwest coast to China. As Greenhow summarizes the condition: "On the North Pacific Coast the direct trade between the American coasts and China remained from 1796 to 1814 almost entirely, as MacKenzie said, in the hands of citizens of the United States; the British merchants were restrained from engaging in it from the opposition of the East India Company; the Russians were not admitted into the Chinese ports; and few ships of any other nation were seen in that part of the ocean." MacKenzie stated the routes and methods of the Americans, and summed them up rather unfavorably as follows: that these American "adventurers acted without regularity or capital, or the desire of conciliating future confidence, and looking only to the interest of the moment."

Much more hostile was the report of Archibald Campbell, in his voyage around the world, 1806 to 1812. He thus describes the course of American traffic:—"These adventurers set out on the voyage with a few trinkets of very little value. In the southern Pacific they pick up some seal skins, and perhaps a few butts of oil; at the Gallipagos they lay in turtle, of which they preserve the shells; at Valparaiso they raise a few dollars in exchange for European articles; at Nootka and other ports of the northwest coasts they traffic with the natives for furs, which when the winter commences they carry to the Sandwich Islands, to dry and preserve from vermin; here they leave their own people to take care of them, and embark, in lieu, the natives of the islands, to assist in navigating the northwest coasts in search of more skins. The remainder of the cargo is then made up of sandal, which

grows abundantly in the woods of Atooi and Owyhee; of tortoise shells, sharks' fins, and pearls of an inferior kind, all of which are acceptable in the China market; and with these and their dollars they purchase cargoes of tea, silks, and nankeens, and thus complete their voyage in the course of two or three years."

Though the tone of the above is not friendly, it is still an admirably succinct statement of the course of trade; and it is hardly to be supposed that the Americans would be more scrupulous or considerate than any other traders. Not until the American people sent missionaries to the islands of the Pacific were the really constructive elements of American society given an opportunity to act. The superiority of the Americans was chiefly at that time in greater boldness, energy, quickness of apprehension, and economy of management. It is not to be expected that men who have no permanent interests in a region will act in its interest. Consequently we find that although for twenty years being almost sole masters of the North Pacific and greatly enriching their own states on the Atlantic, and building up an American merchant marine, which easily in the War of 1812 furnished their country a navy that well-nigh swept British commerce from the seas, the operations of the American traders on this coast disappeared like a dream, leaving no lasting sign except the first and most momentous act of all—that of the discovery of the Columbia. Around this point is focalized all the subsequent American history in the Pacific for half a century.

That the American seamen had their share of sufferings is well shown in the little book of John R. Jewett, the armorer of the ship "Boston" of Boston, which was captured by Maquinna at Nootka, all on board being put to death except Jewett and one other. Jewett remained in captivity from 1803 to 1807, and gives a minute and rather favorable account of the Nootkan chief.

THE DISCOVERERS OF LAKE SUPERIOR.

BY HENRY C. CAMPBELL.

DARING and hardy, far more than most of those voyageurs who have filled the annals of the northwest with romance and adventure, Pierre-Esprit Radisson and Medard Chouart des Groseilliers are to the history of the Lake Superior country what Jean Nicolet is to the history of the Lake Michigan region.

Following the footsteps of Nicolet, there came to Wisconsin two nameless voyageurs, who, according to the Jesuit "Relations" of 1656, returned to Quebec in August of that year from a voyage of two years to the region of Green Bay. There is some reason to suppose that these two men were Radisson and Groseilliers, for Radisson, in his memoirs, claims that he and Groseilliers journeyed to the far west at about that time. If his claim is true, he and Groseilliers were the two nameless voyageurs of 1654-6, but, unless they were the nameless voyageurs, Radisson's whole story about a voyage made to the Lake Michigan region prior to his authenticated voyage to Lake Superior is not to be credited.

Keeping in mind the fact that the voyage of the nameless explorers, chronicled in the Jesuit "Relations" for 1656, occupied two years, it is necessary to note that Radisson did not reach New France until the spring of 1651; that he was captured by the Mohawks in 1652, and did not regain his liberty until the spring of 1654; that Radisson and Groseilliers were members of the French colony which went into the Onondaga country in New York in 1657, and that they, with other colonists, after barely escaping with their lives, fled to the French settlements. In 1660, Radisson and Groseilliers

returned from their voyage to Lake Superior, and it is certain that they never afterward went west. The only period during which they could have visited the region of Green Bay was between the spring of 1654 and the fall of 1656; hence the contention that either they were the explorers of 1654-6, whom the Jesuit "Relations" mention, though not by name, or that Radisson "drew the long bow" when he described an earlier western voyage than that which he and Groseilliers made to Lake Superior.

The problem presented becomes all the more important in view of the theory, advanced by not a few, that Radisson and Groseilliers, prior to this Lake Superior voyage, actually discovered the Upper Mississippi River. The theory rests solely upon Radisson's unsupported statement. The portion of his narrative relating to this discovery lacks the coherence and convincing quality of the corroborated portions of his memoirs. It is apparent, however, that Radisson means to claim that he and Groseilliers explored Lake Michigan; that they visited the Potawotami and the Mascoutens, as Nicolet had done; that they spent some time on Lake Superior, not far above Sault Ste. Marie, and that they not only discovered the Upper Mississippi River, but that they descended it almost if not quite to the Gulf of Mexico.

The claim of Radisson and Groseilliers to the honor of exploring Lake Michigan and the central part of Wisconsin depends entirely upon their being identical with the nameless voyageurs of 1654-6. When compared with established history in relation to those unnamed travelers, Radisson's statements are full of contradictions. The men mentioned in the Jesuit "Relations" report spending only two years in the west, whereas Radisson, three different times, says that he and Groseilliers did not return until the end of the third year, which would be the summer of 1657. Now, Groseilliers, who was sergeant-major of the garrison of Three Rivers in February, 1654, was again at Three Rivers on September 29,

1656, so that he might have been west during the period of 1654-6, which is that of the nameless voyageurs, but it is certain that he was at Three Rivers about a year before, the time, according to his own statement, that he and Groseilliers returned from the west.

There are other weak points in Radisson's narrative, but those already set forth demonstrate that his description of a voyage to Lake Michigan is false in its entirety unless he and Groseilliers were really the explorers of Wisconsin (during 1654-6) whom the Jesuit "Relations" do not name. And, even if the nameless ones who did visit Wisconsin during 1654-6 were Radisson and Groseilliers, Radisson, as already pointed out, is convicted of falsehood in regard to the time that the voyage occupied, as well as to the extent of country which he and Groseilliers explored during their voyage. Radisson's claim of having anticipated Joliet and Marquette in the discovery of the upper Mississippi River, to say nothing of his claim of having descended the stream to its mouth years before La Salle's descent to the Gulf of Mexico, cannot be conceded, except upon strong evidence. As a matter of fact, it is supported by the weakest kind of testimony, the word of a man who, like many another traveler of his time, related as facts things that he imagined or invented. A perjured witness is not to be believed. Under the most favorable view of the case that the facts warrant, Radisson and Groseilliers, if they engaged in a western voyage at all previously to their exploration of Lake Superior, did little or nothing more in the way of exploration than Jean Nicolet had done twenty years before.

Their Lake Superior voyage, however, gives Radisson and Groseilliers conspicuous places in Wisconsin history. It is a satisfaction to turn from the narrative, more or less false, perhaps wholly so, of a voyage to Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River, to the story of their real achievements a few years later.

In August, 1600, as we learn from the Jesuit "Relations" of that year, there returned to Quebec two nameless voyageurs who had explored the southern shore of Lake Superior, had visited the Hurons—fugitives first from the Iroquois and then from the Sioux—near the headquarters of the Black River, in northern Wisconsin, and who had been guests of honor in the skin lodges and the mud cabins of the Sioux of northern Minnesota. These men were Radisson and Groseilliers.

Radisson was the son of Sebastien-Hayet Radisson and Madeleine Herault, and he was a native of St. Malo, in Brittany. He was a mere youth when on May 21, 1651, he settled with his parents at Three Rivers on the St. Lawrence, nearly midway between Quebec and Montreal.

Groseilliers was born in Brie, France, of humble parents. He came to America some time before he was twenty-one years of age, and entered the service of the Jesuits in the capacity of *donne*, or volunteer lay helper. He remained in that service a number of years. In 1646, having become familiar with the region lying between the French settlements and Lake Huron, as well as conversant with the Huron and Algonquin languages, he engaged in the fur trade with the Huron Indians.

Groseilliers married twice. On September 3, 1647, he married Helene Martin, a daughter of Abraham Martin, whose name is borne by the historic plains of Quebec. She was the widow of Claude Etienne and a goddaughter of the great Champlain, who had given to her the Christian name of his own wife. She died in 1651, and on August 24, 1653, Groseilliers married Marguerite Radisson, also a widow, sister of the man who was destined to be his almost inseparable companion.

Radisson has given us a record of his wanderings, but it was not until 1885 that his "Journal" was published, the credit for printing this valuable contribution to American

history being due to the Prince Society of Boston. The manuscript of Radisson's first four voyages, including two journeys to the west in company with Groseilliers, are in the Bodleian Library, while narratives of subsequent experiences at Hudson Bay are in the British Museum. Before they were lodged in these secure places, the Radisson manuscripts were nearly lost at one time, being treated as worthless. They were finally rescued by collectors.

At the mouth of French River, Radisson and Groseilliers, who had left the French settlements contrary to the mandate of the French king's representatives at Quebec, turned westward along Georgian Bay, and were soon at Sault Ste. Marie, where they rested and feasted. Radisson says that at that place they found the truth of what the Indians had often said, that they "should make good cheare of fish that they call Assickmack, which signifieth a white fish. The beare, the castors, and ye Oriniack showed themselves often, but to their cost; indeed, it was to us like a terrestriall paradise." From the Sault the explorers went to Chequamegon Bay. Radisson gives us very clear descriptions of the places that they passed on the way, including the Grand Portal, to which he gave his Christian name, and Keweenaw Bay and Keweenaw Point. They portaged across Keweenaw Point. Their Huron companions who had accompanied them all the way from the lower St. Lawrence, left them at Chequamegon Bay to visit their own nation, which at that time dwelt in north-western Wisconsin, some distance inland.

On the shore of Chequamegon Bay, near Whittlesey's Creek or Shore's Landing, Radisson and Groseilliers built a little hut, the first structure erected by white men on the shore of Lake Superior. Radisson's description of it is interesting. He says: "We went about to make a fort of stakes, wch was in this manner. Suppose that the water side had ben in one end; att the same end there should be murtherers, and att need we made a bastion in a trinagle to defend us from an

assault. The doore was neare the watter side, our fire was in the midle, and our bed on the right hand, covered. There were boughs of trees all about our fort layed across, one uppon another. Besides these boughs, we had a long cord tyed wth some small bells, wch weare senteryes."

Within two weeks fifty Hurons came and escorted the two white men to their village, which was situate "five great days' journeys" inland. After the usual winter hunt, the Hurons and the explorers met again near a small lake, and soon a large number of Ottawas joined them. Five hundred of these Indians died of famine, and Radisson's description of the scenes of horror that were enacted in that dismal winter camp, upon the site of which may now be one of the flourishing towns of northern Wisconsin, would be hard to excel in graphic power. They ate the bark of trees, powder made of bones, filthy furs. "We became the image of death," Radisson writes. "We mistook ourselves very often, taking the living for the dead and ye dead for the living."

Later in the winter the Frenchmen and their Indian companions wandered into the Sioux country, between the St. Croix and upper Mississippi Rivers, and were visited by the Sioux. Somewhere in that country, according to Radisson, the Indians built a fort 600 by 603 feet. Radisson visited the Christinoes, at three days' journey, and he and Groseilliers spent six weeks in a Sioux camp which was seven days' journey from the big fort. They returned to Chequamegon Bay before Lake Superior was free of ice, and Radisson says that from that point they went to the Bay of the North, as Hudson's Bay was called by the French in those days. Radisson speaks of finding on the shore of Hudson Bay barracks that Europeans had built, and there is no doubt that he claims for himself and Groseilliers the honor of reaching Hudson Bay by an inland route. He says that they returned from the Bay by another river than that by which they had reached it. About the middle of winter they reached the big

fort which the Indians had built in northern Minnesota, and during the following summer they returned to the French settlements.

This voyage terminated in August, 1660, and Radisson and Groseilliers are the two nameless explorers of Lake Superior whose achievements are recorded in the Jesuit "Relations" of that year. Radisson himself says that in returning from the Lake Superior voyage, he and Groseilliers passed the Long Sault, on the Ottawa River, very soon after the massacre of Dollard and his companions by the Iroquois, a memorable event in early Canadian history, which occurred in May, 1660. Moreover, on the outward voyage, when he gave his own name to the Grand Portal, he says that he was the first Christian that had seen it, a statement that would not be true had the Lake Superior voyage taken place at a later date, for Father Menard, the first clergyman to set foot upon Wisconsin soil, passed the Pictured Rocks of Lake Superior in the fall of 1660. With the exception of his story about going to Hudson Bay, Radisson's narrative of his Lake Superior voyage tallies with what the Jesuit "Relations" of 1660 say about the two nameless explorers and the places they saw, the Indians whom they visited, and the customs of those Indians.

The situation, summed up briefly, is simply this: The Jesuit "Relations" tell us of two Frenchmen who went to the head of Lake Superior, visited the Hurons and the Sioux, and returned in August, 1660. Radisson describes a similar journey by himself and Groseilliers, and while he makes no direct statement of the time of his return, his narrative shows that it was in the summer of 1660. Finally, the "Journal of the Jesuits," a sort of official diary kept by the Jesuit Superior at Quebec, sets at rest any possible doubt on the subject by mentioning the arrival of the same Indian flotilla that brought down to Quebec the two Frenchmen

who are nameless in the Jesuit "Relations," and by supplying the name of Groseilliers as one of them.

It is difficult to accept Radisson's statement that he and Groseilliers, during their Lake Superior voyage, penetrated to Hudson Bay. Pierre-Esprit Radisson, on April 25, 1659, at Three Rivers, was godfather of a daughter of Groseilliers, Father Menard performing the ceremony, and the Jesuit "Relations" and the "Journal of the Jesuits" show that both Radisson and Groseilliers, on their Lake Superior voyage, which ended in August, 1660, were gone only a year, too short a time for them to cover all the other territory that they really appear to have traveled and to visit Hudson Bay as well.

Radisson and Groseilliers had gone to Lake Superior against the governor's wishes, and when they returned, Radisson says, they lost most of their valuable furs by confiscation, a mode of punishment profitable to the governor, according to the explorer. Groseilliers, in the fall of 1660, the season that ships usually left for France, went to Paris to obtain justice. He could not have returned before the following spring or early summer. He spent six months in France, unsuccessful at court, but came back with the promise of a Rochelle merchant to send a ship the following spring to take him and Radisson to Hudson Bay, of which, during their Lake Superior voyage, they had heard much, even if they had not visited. Disappointed by the Rochelle merchant, they engaged with some Boston merchants to undertake a voyage to Hudson Bay, and in the spring of 1663 they started for that region, which, on account of its richness in furs, they longed to reach; but at Hudson Straits the captain turned back, his plea being inadequate provision. At Boston they made another engagement to go to Hudson Bay, merchants agreeing to equip two ships for them. The ships were not furnished and litigation with the Boston merchants resulted, our adventurers being unsuccessful.

This must have been in 1664. The following year some of the English commissioners appointed to attend to the evacuation of New York by the Dutch induced the two Frenchmen to go from Boston to England and urge the establishment of fur-trading centers at Hudson Bay, which, although it had been explored many years before by English navigators, including Hudson and Button, had never been settled by any nation.

In England, Radisson and Groseilliers won the favor of Prince Rupert and were granted an audience by Charles II., who at that time, on account of the plague in London, held court at Oxford. The king granted the adventurers forty shillings a week and chambers at Windsor, and promised them a ship in the spring of 1666. But it was not until 1668 that the proposed expedition to Hudson Bay started, and then a storm drove Radisson's ship (the "Eagle," Captain Stannard) back to England, while the "Nonsuch," which bore Groseilliers and was commanded by Captain Zachary Gillam, went on to Hudson Bay. The result of the expedition was the establishment during the same year of a fort at the mouth of the Nemiskau River, now known as Rupert's River, at the head of James Bay, where Fort Rupert stands today. The following year Radisson himself took possession of Port Nelson in the name of the King of England. It was in 1668, after being forced back to England, that Radisson finished his account of his Lake Superior voyage.

Our two adventurers thus became the promoters of the Hudson's Bay Company, which was chartered in 1670 by Charles II., Prince Rupert being at the head of it. The company was given exclusive possession of Hudson Bay and of all the territory drained by the stream running into it. In return for this royal grant, Charles II. modestly stipulated that the company was to give him every year two elks and two black beavers.

About the time that the Hudson's Bay company was char-

tered, Radisson married a daughter of John Kirke, one of the charter members of the company, and a descendant of one of the Kirkes who in 1629 forced Champlain to surrender Quebec to the English. Some time after the incorporation of the Hudson Bay's Company, John Kirke was knighted by Charles II.

Radisson and Groseilliers, who meantime had been active at Hudson's Bay, in English interests, were pardoned by Louis XIV. and reappeared in New France in 1678. Frontenac had no employment for them, however, and Radisson joined the French fleet which reduced the island of Tobago and other Dutch possessions in the West Indies. Groseilliers remained with his family at Three Rivers. In 1681, after he had twice visited England to persuade his wife to live with him in France, Radisson appeared again at Quebec and entered the service of the Company of the North. He and Groseilliers were placed in command of two ships and sailed for Hudson's Bay to plant a French establishment. They anchored at Hayes River. They had many adventures, including the capture of the English governor, one Bridger. The ship which had brought Bridger to the bay was commanded by Captain Zachary Gillam, to whom the navigation in those northern waters seemed to have no terrors. In the winter of 1682-3 Gillam's ship was crushed by the ice and he was drowned. His son, who had charge of a Boston ship, was captured by the French by strategy and his vessel was seized. Leaving a son of Groseilliers in charge of Fort Nelson, and sending Bridger to James Bay, Radisson and Groseilliers went to Quebec. De la Barre, the governor of New France, returned the Boston ship to its owners, and for so doing was reprimanded by Seignelay, the French minister of marine, who said the English would not fail to use the surrender of the ship to strengthen their claim to Nelson River.

On April 10, 1684, Louis XIV. wrote to de la Barre that

the British king had complained to him about the acts of Radisson and Groseilliers. The French king suggested to his representative in New France that it would be well to propose to the commandant at Hudson's Bay that neither the French nor the English should have power to make any new establishments in that region, the wily monarch adding that the proposition would no doubt be readily accepted, as the English had no power to prevent his subjects from forming establishments at Nelson River, at that time a French possession.

It was late in 1683 when Radisson and Groseilliers returned to Quebec from Hudson's Bay, and a few weeks later they were in Paris. Lord Preston, the English ambassador, who had been complaining about their acts at Hudson's Bay, induced them to re-enter the Hudson's Bay Company's service. Radisson, leaving Groseilliers in England, sailed early in the spring of 1684 for Hudson's Bay, and took possession of the French post at Nelson River, as well as of a large quantity of valuable furs which the French had obtained since the previous year. Young Groseilliers, according to Radisson, promptly surrendered the post. The furs taken from the French were twenty thousand in number and they were sold for £7,000. Radisson went back to London the same year.

For returning to the service of the Hudson's Bay Company, Radisson had been promised £50 a year, £200 of stock in the company, and £20 to equip him for the trip to Port Nelson. Groseilliers was to receive twenty shillings a week. When Radisson, laden with the spoil of the French post at Nelson River, returned to England, the company rewarded him with a gratuity of one hundred guineas. Groseilliers, not having joined Radisson in re-entering the company's service, the stipend of twenty shillings a week was transferred to his son, Radisson's nephew, at Hudson Bay. The younger Groseilliers was engaged by the company for four years at

£100 a year. Shortly afterward, Radisson had a dispute with the company about his own salary, and it was finally arranged that he should have £100 a year, and that upon his death £300 in cash and £100 in stock should be paid to his wife. The company seemed desirous of pleasing Radisson, for it sent to him at Hudson's Bay a hogshead of claret, "such as Mr. R. shall like." Radisson returned to England in October of that year.

It is recorded that in 1685 Radisson and his nephew had gone up Hayes or St. Theresa River, intending to spend the winter. In 1686 de Troyes and Iberville, with a company of other French-Canadians, marched overland from the St. Lawrence and captured Forts Hayes, Rupert, and Albany. Denonville, in a letter to his superiors, afterward stated that he had ordered de Troyes to capture only the fort which contained Radisson, for whom a reward had been authorized. The expedition did not capture Radisson, however, for in March, 1687, Louis XIV. himself wrote to Denonville that Radisson had done a great deal of harm to the colony and was likely to do more. He advised the capture of Radisson, and if he could not be captured he suggested that an attempt be made to prevail upon him to leave the service of the English. To this end the king authorized the governor and the intendant of New France to make any suitable terms with him.

In October of that year Radisson reached England from Hudson's Bay. In June, 1688, he again went to Hudson's Bay. He seems to have been successful in making money for the company and for himself as well, for in 1688 he received a dividend of £100, being fifty per cent. upon his £200 of stock, and in 1689 a dividend of twenty-five per cent. was paid to him. "The great dividend" of 1690 yielded him £150 on his holding of £200 worth of stock. In 1692, however, owing to French rivalry at the Bay, which reduced the company's profits, Radisson was being paid only £50 a year. He,

in consequence, found himself unable to support his wife and four or five children, as, of the £50, the sum of £24 went for house rent alone. A petition to the company in his behalf states that unless it grants relief to him, he will be compelled to abandon his family and shift for himself. It is set forth that his shares in the company cease with his life, and that as France has set a price upon his head, he cannot in safety return to that country or to New France. Emphasis is placed upon the fact that King Charles I. had frequently recommended Radisson to the kindness of the company. This plea in behalf of Radisson was made by William Young, who stated that Radisson was the author of the company's prosperity, and who asked that a reward offered by the company, which he had refused, for persuading Radisson to join the company, be given to Radisson "in his great necessity."

The committee of the company, in reply to this petition, stated that in 1681 or 1682, after receiving £20 from the company, Radisson and Groseilliers absconded, went to France and thence to Canada. Next year they joined their countrymen in an expedition to Fort Nelson, animated by the report of Mr. Abram to the company that it was the best "place for a factory." The reply outlines the history of the earlier years of exploiting the fur trade at Hudson Bay. This interesting finding regarding Radisson is contained in the reply: "Never found him accused of cheating and purloining, but breach of contract with the company, after receiving their money, we do find him guilty of."

This document shows two interesting facts. One is that Radisson, however fickle he might be, was honest in his pecuniary dealings with the master whom he served for the time being. The other is that the company, as represented by its committee, was ungrateful to the man whose daring and enterprise had added much to their wealth and likewise much to Great Britain's prestige in North America. All that the committee did to relieve Radisson's condition was to order

that the sum of £50 be advanced to him—"to be repaid out of the next dividend." Young was dropped from the committee, probably for befriending him. Radisson, indignant, and probably influenced by the advice of Young, filed a suit in chancery against the company. The court awarded judgment in his favor for the amount of the arrears in full. The committee finally compromised with Radisson upon the basis of £150 in cash and £100 a year for life, though whenever the company made a dividend, which of course would benefit Radisson, his annuity was to be only £50.

In 1698, when the company asked parliament to renew its charter, Radisson filed a petition that a clause should be inserted in the new charter protecting him in the regular payments of the amounts due to him from the corporation. He stated in his petition to parliament that he had four children and that his only means of subsistence is the £100 a year which the company had agreed to pay him. In 1700, although he received regularly, in quarterly instalments, the money due him from the company, he was reduced to the necessity of asking for the position of warehouse keeper of the company at London. His application was unsuccessful. For the next ten years he continued to live in England. The last payment to him by the company was made January 6, 1710, and therefore he is supposed to have died early in the year. His children are said to have gone to New France to live. Groseilliers, his brother-in-law, had died in New France in 1698. France could forgive Groseilliers, but Radisson, the more daring and enterprising adventurer, had wrought much greater harm to France and her interests in North America, and when he died he was still regarded as the foe of his native country.

THE CHARTER AND CONSTITUTION OF CONNECTICUT.

BY LYNDE HARRISON.

THE independent, self-constituted governments of Hartford and New Haven were brought together under the charter which Charles II. gave to Governor Winthrop and his associates in 1662. This charter continued to be the fundamental law of Connecticut until 1818. Unsuccessful efforts to revoke it were made a few years later, and, except Rhode Island, it was the only one of the colonies that retained its English charter in lieu of a constitution after the war for independence. During that war the other eleven colonies adopted state constitutions.

The government consisted of a governor and general assembly, elected by those who were qualified under the charter and local laws to vote. All the executive officials except the governor, and all the judicial officers, were appointed by the general assembly. The general assembly was divided into two branches, one a council of twelve members, who were elected annually on a general ticket. The lower and controlling branch of the general assembly consisted of two representatives from each township.

As new towns were formed, from time to time, by the general assembly, each was entitled to two representatives. During the latter part of the eighteenth century, however, as new towns were established by the general assembly, there was a provision put in each special act that the new town was organized upon the condition that it should be entitled to only one representative in the general assembly. This reduction from two to one was partly a measure of economy to save

the salary of the extra representative, and partly because the halls at Hartford and New Haven, where the assembly met, were small and had become somewhat crowded because of the increase in the number of representatives caused by the organization of new towns.

When the independence of the United States was recognized all the states except Rhode Island and Connecticut had adopted constitutions; but the people of Connecticut were so well satisfied with their charter that they treated it as their fundamental law for thirty years.

The powers of the general assembly were practically unlimited; and after the adoption of the federal constitution the general assembly of Connecticut continued to enjoy its unlimited powers of legislation, subject only to the few restrictions imposed upon the states by the constitution of the United States.

In nearly all the towns of Connecticut at that time the members of the Congregational or standing order of the churches formed a majority of the voters. The representatives were generally members of that church. Special privileges were enjoyed by the societies of the Congregational churches. For many years all persons residing in the limits of the Congregational societies were obliged to contribute, according to their means, for the support of the Congregational churches and societies, without regard to whether they were members or attendants upon that church. Gradually other denominations, especially the Episcopalians, Methodists, and Baptists, began to increase in numbers. There was much agitation and bad feeling growing out of the privileges and preferences which the Congregational societies enjoyed. Finally a law was passed providing that, under certain circumstances, residents within the limits of any Congregational society could, by filing a proper statement in the office of the society clerk, be released from contributing to the support of the Congregational church, if they actually were members

of other Christian churches and contributed to the support of such churches. In the absence of such a statement being filed, all residents were obliged to continue to contribute to the support of the Congregational church. In many other respects the Congregational churches and societies, and the settled ministers of that church, enjoyed special privileges.

For more than twenty years there was much agitation on the part of the members of the Jeffersonian Republican party, who were in a minority, in favor of a constitution for Connecticut.

Early in the last century a local political party was formed, known as the "Toleration" party, the members of which favored a constitutional convention and the adoption of a constitution for Connecticut. Under the leadership of Oliver Wolcott of Litchfield, this party finally succeeded in securing a call for a convention. The constitutional convention met at Hartford in September, 1818, and prepared the present constitution of the state, which was submitted to the people and adopted.

Many of the provisions of this constitution continued, as the fundamental law of Connecticut, the practices and provisions of the charter of 1662 and some of the general laws passed by the general assembly under that charter.

Governor Oliver Wolcott was president of the convention which concluded its labors on the 15th day of September, 1818. The men who framed it considered that they were practically adopting, in many respects, the provisions of the famous charter. In the preamble to the constitution they stated that in order to more effectually define, secure, and perpetuate the liberties, rights, and privileges which they had derived from their ancestors, they had, after a careful consideration and revision, ordained and established the following constitution and form of civil government.

The first article contained a declaration in the nature of a bill of rights. In it they declared that when men form a

social compact all are equal in rights, that all political power is inherent in the people, and that they have at all times the right to alter their form of government in such manner as they may deem expedient.

In order to satisfy those advocates of the constitution who desired more freedom of religious profession, they declared that the exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, should forever be free to all persons in the state, subject to the limitation that the right thereby declared should not be so construed as to justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state; and also that no preference should be given by law to any Christian sect or mode of worship. Other provisions of the bill of rights protected the right of trial by jury and the well-understood common-law rights of persons accused of crime.

The eleventh section of the bill of rights contained the important provision that the property of no person should be taken for public use without just compensation therefor. The second article of the constitution divided the powers of government into three distinct departments—the legislative, executive, and judicial. There were no limitations in this constitution upon the power of the general assembly, except to the extent they were limited by the provisions of the bill of rights.

The legislature was divided into two branches, the senate and the house of representatives. The senate consisted of twelve members, to be chosen annually by the electors. The senate, therefore, was practically the old council, consisting of the same number of members, and they were elected upon a general ticket by all electors of the state.

The house of representatives was continued as under the charter. The number of representatives from each town was to continue the same as practiced in 1818, only the old towns having two representatives, and those recently created only one. In case a new town should thereafter be

incorporated, the constitution provided that such new towns should be entitled to one representative only; but if such new town should be made from one or more towns, the town or towns from which the same should be made should be entitled to the same number of representatives as previously allowed, unless the number should be reduced by the consent of such town or towns. There were very few cases thereafter when the parent town lost its double representation. Soon after the adoption of this constitution, North Branford was created from Branford with one representative; but the electors of the old town consented to forfeit their double representation in the general assembly. Some years later, when New Britain was created a new town, by separation from Berlin, an arrangement was made in the general assembly by which Berlin retained only one representative, and New Britain took the two that had belonged to the old town of Berlin.

Article four of the constitution provided for the executive department. The governor, lieutenant-governor, treasurer, and secretary were to be elected by the electors, and the provisions of the section required that if no person should have a majority of the whole number of votes, the general assembly should choose the executive officers from the names of the two persons having the greatest number of votes. This provision of the constitution continued as a part of the fundamental law of the state until 1901. A comptroller was annually appointed by the general assembly, but this provision was changed by article five of the amendments which were adopted in November 1836. Sheriffs were appointed for each county by the general assembly for terms of three years, and in case of death or resignation the governor had power to fill the vacancy until the same should be filled by the general assembly.

Article seven of the amendments adopted in 1838 provided that sheriffs should thereafter be appointed by the electors in each county for terms of three years; and in 1886, by article

twenty-eight of the amendments, sheriffs were to be elected thereafter for terms of four years.

The fifth article of the constitution provided for the judicial power of the state, which was vested in a supreme court, a superior court, and such inferior courts as the general assembly should from time to time establish. It was also provided that there should be appointed by the general assembly in each county a sufficient number of justices of the peace, with such jurisdiction as the assembly might prescribe. All the judges were to be appointed by the general assembly. Judges of the supreme and superior court were to hold their offices during good behavior, and all other judges and justices of the peace were to be appointed annually. No judge or justice of the peace, however, is capable of holding his office after arriving at the age of seventy years.

Article six of the constitution provided for the qualifications of electors, and also provided, to a certain extent, the regulations concerning elections. The qualifications of electors were prescribed in the second section, and directed that every white male citizen of the United States who had gained a settlement in the state, and had attained the age of twenty-one years, and had resided in the town at least six months preceding, could be admitted an elector if he had a freehold estate of a yearly value of seven dollars, or had been enrolled in the militia and had performed military duty for the term of one year, or had paid a state tax within the year next preceding and had sustained a good moral character. The privileges of an elector were forfeited by a conviction of bribery, forgery, perjury, dueling, fraudulent bankruptcy, theft, or other offence for which an infamous punishment is inflicted.

Section seven of this article provided that in all elections the votes of electors should be by ballot, and the selectmen and town clerk were given power to decide on the qualifications of electors, at such times and in such manner as might be prescribed by law.

Article seven of the constitution contained what was then deemed a very important provision—the subject of religion and the right to worship. It was declared to be the duty of all men to worship the supreme being, but that they had the right to render that worship in the mode most consistent with the dictates of their consciences; and that no person should by law be compelled to join or support any church or religious association. It was further provided, however, that every person then belonging to such church or association should remain a member thereof in the manner thereafter provided, and that every society or denomination of Christians should have the right to support their churches and ministers by a tax upon the members of such society.

The second section of the article provided that any person might separate himself from the society of Christians to which he belonged, by leaving a written notice thereof with the clerk of such society, and he should thereupon be no longer liable for any future expenses which might be incurred by the society.

Article eight of the constitution especially protected the charter of Yale College and the fund called the school fund.

Article nine provided for impeachment of any or all of the executive or judicial officers.

Article ten specified the form of oath of office to be taken by all officers, and that each town should annually elect selectmen and other officers of local police. The rights and duties of all corporations were not to be affected in any way, except to the extent that there were restrictions in the constitution.

Section four of this article stipulated that no judge of the superior court or the supreme court, no member of congress, no person holding the office of treasurer, secretary, or comptroller, and no sheriff or sheriff's deputy should be a member of the general assembly.

The eleventh article provided for amendments to the con-

stitution, which to be adopted must be first proposed by a majority of the house of representatives, then approved by two-thirds of each house at the next session of the general assembly, and then ratified by a majority of all the electors of the state at town meetings warned and held for the purpose. For nearly fifty years after the adoption of this constitution no important amendments were carried. In 1828 three amendments were adopted which provided for a senate of not less than eighteen nor more than twenty-four members, to be chosen by districts. Under these amendments, the senate was fixed at twenty-one and continued to be that number until 1881, when the number was increased to twenty-four, and the number of senators elected by districts continued to be twenty-four until and including 1903; at which time, under the amendment adopted in 1901, the senate was increased to thirty-five.

In October, 1845, an amendment was adopted erasing the property and tax qualification necessary to make citizens electors.

In 1855 article eleven of the amendments required that every person should be able to read any article of the constitution or any section of the statutes before being made an elector; and in 1897 article twenty-nine of the amendments provided that the applicant should be able to read them in the English language. This last amendment was adopted because in some of the towns naturalized citizens who were unable to read in English had been presented with copies of the constitution printed in foreign languages.

Changes were made in the provisions concerning the judicial department of the state by amendments adopted in 1850 and 1856, when it was provided that judges of probate and justices of the peace should be appointed by the electors from the several towns and districts, and that judges of the supreme court of errors and the superior court, appointed in

the year 1855 and thereafter, should hold their offices for the term of eight years.

In 1870 there was much discussion throughout the country concerning changes in the constitutions of the several states. Conventions after conventions were held in the reconstructed southern states; and the states of Pennsylvania, Illinois, and other northern states adopted, amended, and improved constitutions, many of them with special limitations upon the powers of the legislatures of such states. The restrictions in the constitution of the United States were not deemed to be sufficient, and the older constitutions of the several states, like that of Connecticut, contained practically but few limitations upon the powers of the legislative bodies.

In 1871 a so-called constitutional reform association was formed in Connecticut. Leading men of both parties, mostly residents of cities, became members of this association. Bills were introduced into the general assembly of 1873, providing for a constitutional convention, but they failed to receive a majority vote. Neither the senate nor the house represented at that time the majority of the electors of the state in the manner that was deemed satisfactory by the electors of the cities. Bridgeport, Meriden, and Derby each had only one representative, because they were so-called new towns.

When the proposed bill for a constitutional convention had been defeated, the friends of constitutional reform prepared several amendments to the constitution, many of which failed; but during the next four years eleven amendments were adopted, having received a two-thirds vote of each branch of the general assembly. Two of these amendments referred to representation in the house of representatives.

Article fifteen, adopted in October, 1874, provided that every town that then contained or thereafter should contain a population of five thousand should be entitled to send two representatives, and every other one should be entitled to its present representation in the general assembly.

Article eighteen, adopted in October, 1876, provided that if any new town should thereafter be incorporated, such new town should not be entitled to representation in the general assembly unless it had twenty-five hundred inhabitants, and unless the town from which the major portion of its territory should be taken had at least twenty-five hundred inhabitants; and that until such town should have at least twenty-five hundred inhabitants, the new town should, for the purpose of representation, be an election district only of the town from which it had been taken, for the purpose of representation in the house of representatives. Prior to the adoption of that amendment, in every decade there had been several new towns of small population incorporated. Since the adoption of the amendment, no new town has been incorporated, except that Ansonia was taken from Derby and made a new town; but at that time both the old and new town had over five thousand population.

In 1875 the time of the election was changed from April to November, and the terms of senators and state officers were extended from one to two years.

In 1884 the terms of members of the house of representatives were increased to two years, and the regular sessions of the general assembly were changed from annual to biennial.

In 1876 the terms of judges of the courts of common pleas and district courts were changed from one to four years, and those of judges of city courts and police courts were made two years. At the same time the terms of the judges of probate were changed from one to two years.

In 1877 two important amendments to the constitution were adopted. The first prohibited the general assembly and all counties, cities, boroughs, towns, and school districts from granting extra compensation to public officers or agents, or *increasing* the compensation of any public officer, to take effect during the continuance in office of the person whose *salary* might be thereby increased; or from increasing the

compensation of any public contractor above the amount specified in the contract. The other amendment then adopted prohibited any county or city or other municipality from becoming a subscriber to the capital stock, or becoming a purchaser of the bonds, of any railroad corporation, or from loaning its credit directly or indirectly in aid of any such corporation. This latter amendment was adopted because many cities, and some of the small towns in the state, had had serious losses from investments or donations for the construction of railroads which failed to be profitable in their operation.

Article twenty-six of the amendments, adopted in October, 1880, changed the method of the appointment of judges of the supreme and superior courts by requiring that they should be appointed upon a nomination of the governor rather than by the nomination of a political caucus.

In October, 1901, article thirty of the amendments changed the method of electing state officers so that they might be elected by a plurality vote, rather than by the general assembly, if candidates failed to receive a majority of all the votes cast.

The constitution of Connecticut, with all the amendments that have been adopted, especially those adopted during the last thirty years, is in the main satisfactory in its provisions to the electors of the state. A constitutional convention was authorized by a vote of the electors in October, 1901, and it held its sessions for several months, beginning in January, 1902. The constitution which they submitted to the people made no substantial changes in the old constitution, except in relation to representation in the lower branch of the general assembly and the method of amending the constitution itself. The electors, however, in both the large and small towns of the state, did not favor the proposed new constitution, and it was defeated at a special election, held in 1902, by a large majority.



..

..

..

..

..

..

..

..

..

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

CONTENTS

Frontispiece: Lewis Morris, Signer of the Declaration of Independence.	
New York in the Nineteenth Century. By John Austin Stevens. (<i>First Paper</i>)	97
Fort Snelling. By Return I. Holcombe	110
The Morris Family of Morrisania (<i>continued</i>). By W. W. Spooner	134
Iowans in John Brown's Raid, and the Author of the Mysterious "Floyd Letter." By the Late Benjamin F. Gue, Lieutenant-Governor of Iowa	143
The Hegeman Family. By James C. Aikin	170
The Residence of Joseph Bonaparte in New Jersey. By Francis Bazley Lee	178
A Coming New York Centenary	189
Book Notices	193

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE is issued on the fifteenth day each of January, March, May, July, September, and November, at Three Dollars per annum, Fifty Cents per single copy. Subscribers failing to receive their copies by the first day of the succeeding month should immediately notify the publishers; otherwise it may not be possible to supply the missing number.

The contents of each number are protected by copyright. Permission to reprint any article or illustration must be specially obtained from the publishers.


Advertising rates will be furnished on application; none but strictly high-class advertising matter will be admitted. Advertisements must be received by the fifteenth day of the month preceding the month of issue.

Application made at the New York Post Office for entry as second-class mail matter.

THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK,
Publishers,
41 Lafayette Place,
New York, U. S. A.

Copyright, 1906, by
THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK.

All rights reserved.



Lewis Morris

Signer of the Declaration of Independence.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. I

MARCH, 1906

NO. 2

NEW YORK CITY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BY JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS.

First Paper.

CAUSES OF ITS PROSPERITY, MATERIAL AND MORAL.

(From a historical address.)

IT is not in the long and labored histories of New York City, no one of which is in every way satisfactory, that the student need look for an intelligent philosophic treatment. The subject is vast, too vast perhaps for generalization. But in default of such comprehensive works our metropolis has had children who were not only warm in their love for their great mother but keen in their appreciation of her past and far seeing in their prophecy of her future. These qualities are to be found in their addresses before our great public societies during the last century—addresses printed in pamphlets, now of extreme rarity, but fortunately preserved in that mine of local information, the library of the New York Historical Society. These studies are of two kinds, one moral, the other economic, but both reminiscent.

As all courses must have their starting-post, so every progress must have its beginning well defined. The Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, the first of our New York centennial orators, from his pulpit on the first day of January, 1801, reviewed the march of the eighteenth century from a high moral standpoint. In this observation of results he naturally, perhaps, neglected details; yet details are

precisely what are most needed in comparative examination. The subsequent history, which was an extension of his address, was in the main a history of mental and moral progress. The Rev. Dr. Samuel Osgood, in an address on the progress of New York delivered before the New York Historical Society in 1865, followed the same line of treatment. Quoting the words of his predecessor, he said: "Very clearly New York religion was not speculative or philosophical, but it was none the less a positive institution, a living force." Dr. Osgood added that "religious liberty has had its grandest organization from this city as a centre," but that Dr. Miller had seen only the beginning of its mighty and benign work.

Without dwelling further on this branch of retrospect, it may be said that the change in the attitude of the world to the discussion of moral and religious problems has been as great in the last fifty years as it was in those which intervened between the addresses of these distinguished clergymen—themselves the very opposites in their religious belief, yet in accord in their acceptance of the moral progress of our city. The change in the manner and spirit of speculative inquiry is assuredly one of the most remarkable features in our psychical history. Though it would be hardly just to call the temper of critical investigation which prevails today iconoclastic, yet many of the images which once held the world in awe are broken and cast down; many a belief has been disproved, many a cherished faith dissipated in the light of modern science—light as unerring as the shafts of the sun-god and as far reaching as the rays of the spectroscope. Toward the close of the nineteenth century, and since, the pulpit and the press of this city have fairly seethed with discussion of psychical and religious tenets. What the outcome from the former will be in the twentieth century no one can foresee. Yet in view of the comparative courtesy and good feeling with which subjects that once evoked the sword and the fire-brand have been

and are now publicly discussed, it is but fair to believe that whether that outcome be separation and particularism or generalization and union, its direction will be toward freedom of thought and expression; freedom from dogmatic prejudice and a further approach to that epoch of peace and good will among men which has been the hope of the sages from remote antiquity and the one fixed aspiration of the Christian world.

Passing to an examination of the more material side of New York progress, it is fortunate to find that its history is not untrodden ground, but that it has been recited at intervals of a quarter of a century by master minds in political science and economy, as well as by lovers of historic reminiscence. The views of the first half of the century by Dix and Betts are from economic and philosophic standpoints; those of Duer and King and Francis are retrospective, and describe what they saw with their eyes or heard from their fathers, with the charm of the chronicler.

While the address of Dix was earliest in the order of time, it seems more convenient for the purpose of the present study to consider first the second of these valuable monographs, by Mr. Samuel Betts. This was an anniversary address delivered before the St. Nicholas Society of New York on December 3, 1851, entitled "The Causes of the Prosperity of New York." It recites the progress of the city from 1709, when New York was still a village with a population not exceeding five thousand souls, of whom one-sixth were slaves. Fifty years later it had hardly risen to thirteen thousand souls, a like proportion being blacks. The subsequent growth was rapid in numbers, and the onward progress was with gigantic strides. The causes that produced this result were of two groups: one external, that is, the commercial relation with Europe, which Mr. Betts does not discuss, confining himself to an examination of the second group of causes, which were internal, of ourselves.

UofM

These he finds to be four in number: the geographical position of the city, the old colonial races, the manners of the colonists, and the systems of laws and government. While it is impossible to fix the precise point of time when the people of New York reached maturity and assumed distinctive characteristics which, combined with the physical advantages of their position and their political and moral organization, had attracted a large population and brought to them their commanding commerce, Mr. Betts holds that it was in the first half of the eighteenth century, from 1700 to 1750, that they possessed an accurate and defined national character and attitude. They had the advantages of a tempered climate and an inexhaustible food supply from land and water close at hand, an inland country rich in soil, and a harbor fit for the navies of the world. As these two causes are naturally linked together, so are the others that he names.

The colonial races whose bloods were mingled in New York veins had each distinctive traits, but were alike champions of civil freedom and of religious freedom. The Batavians, as Tacitus tells us, were distinguished for their valor. This their Dutch descendants have never lacked, as was lately shown in the Boer struggle in South Africa. Moreover, the thriving colonies of Holland proved their commercial genius. Their great jurist Grotius established a new code of international law, which, while it defines the privileges of the conqueror, does not forget the rights of the conquered; rights which, it may be here observed, have not been respected in the story of European conquests from the time of the partition of Poland to that of the denationalization of Alsace-Lorraine. The English settlers in New York were of a generation of men of the Bible and the sword, but men who, in this country at least, while knowing and jealous of their own rights, were willing to respect the rights of others though not of their own race or belief. Joined here in New York in not unequal measure, the Dutch

and the English lived in harmony. What jealousies of race they had disappeared when William of Orange came to the English throne not far from the end of the seventeenth century. That New York escaped the narrowness of New England puritanism was due to the fact that religious freedom had as much to do with immigration to New York as commercial freedom. Indeed, many of its merchants came from New England by way of the Barbadoes and other English West India islands, whose settlers, fugitives or exiles after the Monmouth rebellion, had chosen asylum there because of the freedom from the religious prejudices of New England.

These two sturdy races, the Hollanders and the Englishmen, trained in the free thought of Erasmus and Melancthon rather than the sterner schools of Luther and of Calvin, had precisely the qualities of which great nations are made:—a bold independence of thought, allied to a strict observance of duty and daring in action in defence of principle. To this race fusion the French Huguenots, though lesser in number, brought similar traits of moral nature, and with these that mildness and amenity of disposition and manner which they inherited from their old world ancestors, who were of the most polite nation in Europe—a leaven to the sterner, heavier mass, a fine temper to the strong steel. While no doubt Mr. Betts was correct in saying that the English and Dutch were the basic foundations of the pillar of the New York state, and that the French gave to it its grace, yet the influence of the Scotch and Irish immigration, though of a somewhat later date, must not be unnoticed:—the Livingstons, the Alexanders, the Coldens were of pure Scotch blood. The Morris Family was Welsh. The Clintons, the Duanes, and MacDougals were of Scotch-Irish stock. The sons of St. Patrick of the eighteenth century were protestants. Indeed, when John Leary, the first of the well-known charitable family of that name, was moved to a confession of his sins on the turf,

where he made his fame as a jockey, it is said that he had to make a pilgrimage to Philadelphia to find a priest.

The third reason or cause of New York prosperity was the system and laws of its government. New York held firmly to the famous declaration of Grotius, which is worth the quoting today, in view of the aggressiveness of the "world-politic." "All the old writers," said he, "Thucydides and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, believed that colonies should be treated as equals and not as tributaries or servants," and he further held the maxim that "colonists by a species of natural necessity must be subject to the mother country is absurd." The people of New York were the first to publicly declare their right to independence from all foreign legislation and to utterly repudiate the doctrine of colonial servitude. They proclaimed this principle in 1691 by act of assembly, and never lost an opportunity to reassert it. They acknowledged subjection to the king under constitutional limitation, but denied the authority of any parliament but their own. Thus we may say that though Faneuil Hall was the cradle of American liberty, the immortal goddess was begotten here.

The fourth cause he considered to be the liberal and cordial manners of the people, which in turn were a consequence of the race blendings. They had the Dutch perseverance without its obstancy, the English independence without its insular arrogance, and the French charm. It is undoubtedly true that a warmth of welcome is encouraging to immigration. Mr. Betts stops with these philosophic opinions, to which some reflections have been here added; but he does not enter the field of statistical comparison.

The first address to which allusion has been made, that is, the first in the order of consideration of New York in the nineteenth century, was that delivered by Mr. John A. Dix, a young student of law in New York City, entitled "A Sketch of the Resources of the City of New York, with a

View of the Municipal Government, from the Foundation," etc., of the city to the date of the latest statistical accounts. This was printed in 1827. Of the amount and quality of this information he found just cause to complain; and a half-century later there was not much improvement. Statistics, in America at least, is a comparatively new science. We have been too busy with doing to measure or count what we have done or what we are doing, to examine the past, or to forecast the future. It is only within the last quarter of the last century that the New York Clearing House, the report of the daily transactions of which is the weather-gauge of the business of the whole country, has made those important figures public—long after they were of immediate value; and it is not much longer since the bureau of statistics at Washington followed the plan devised and practiced by the New York Chamber of Commerce of public statements of the business of the United States in its commercial and financial lines. Here again we find New York leading in this important branch of political economy, and to Mr. Dix must be credited the first use of this class of information in a practical manner a half-century previously. Gouverneur Morris, whose mind and training had been in administrative lines, as well as in the more abstract study of political economy in its higher sense, once said of New York that, "Children of commerce, we were rocked in the cradle of war and sucked in the principles of liberty with our mother's milk." Even he, a descendant of a long line of statesmen did not forget that the origin of the fortune of his family was trade, while its growth was from the values of real estate created and increased by trade and commerce. And indeed it would be hard to find any one of our wealthy families whose beginning was not industry or commerce. Mr. Dix, holding the same view, philosophically remarks that "the origin of every city may be traced to commercial or manufacturing interests. New York had its origin in commercial interests. New Amsterdam was founded

for trade." Mr. Dix, in his review of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, remarks that the city "had grown solely by the force of its natural advantages," and he further observes that "it will not be until her facilities for artificial communication are fully disclosed that all the principles of her future prosperity will be brought into operation." Here he no doubt had in mind the possibilities of a closer steam railroad communication with the interior, the development of the canal system, and the improvements in navigation. With regard to manufacture as a promoter of progress, he remarked: "The island of Manhattan, in which the city lies, has no facilities for manufacturing purposes"—doubtless basing this opinion upon the insufficiency of the water supply, then indispensable to successful industries or manufactures. But as a scholar he could not have forgotten the achievement of Rome in her great aqueduct, by which the waters from the distant Appenines were brought into the imperial city—that one and only cosmopolitan city of the ancient world, which has not as yet been rivalled, but which New York now promises to surpass. It is just possible that Mr. Dix did not separate in his conclusions manufactures from industries, as we do to-day; industries being the development of the soil product, while manufactures, as the word implies, are the hand-fashionings of that product in gross and detail—or, considered in a still higher sense, the results of skilled labor applied with a regard to taste and art, by which Paris has set the fashion—in what we now term the "applied arts"—in decoration and ornament to the western world. The cost of materials in itself being small, the result attained by hand work brings to those engaged in it large returns. It is to the peculiar distinction enjoyed by Paris in this respect that she chiefly owes her wealth, as does Vienna; and within recent times New York has been reaching out for a like distinction, to the great promotion of her prosperity and renown.

Mr. Dix estimated that from 1755 to 1790 the population

of New York had progressed beyond that of all the other modern cities, and that it had doubled in the ten years which followed. He observes that in 1790 it was already considered that New York was destined to take the lead in the western world, and had become a general mart for the exchange of foreign and domestic productions, though as yet only through natural physical advantages. The wars in Europe at the close of the eighteenth century caused a great demand for American products or the products of other nations which were carried in American bottoms or under the American flag.

To pass to the second part of his historic review, Mr. Dix notes that the municipal charter of 1686 established the corporation. Its powers were increased in 1706, but it was not till 1732 that New York was made a "free city," appointments emanating directly from the sovereign through provincial authority. We must here remember that New York was a province, being an appanage of the crown by right of conquest from the Dutch in 1664. In 1803 the old division of the city was changed, and ten wards were created. The charter government Mr. Dix describes as a "fabric of arbitrary power resting on a popular basis, the citizens having directly or indirectly a voice in the election of its officers." The New York state constitution of 1821 confirmed this order of city government. By it the city was given a right to take and condemn private property for public purposes, paying for value—a right expressly forbidden by the charter of James II., except with consent of the owner. The power given to police justices to commit vagrants without trial by jury, granted in 1750, was extended in 1820, the limit of sixty days of detention previously allowed being enlarged to six months—a power which is in direct collision with the provisions of the constitution of the United States. This is surely an arbitrary power, but, as Mr. Dix says, "a greater degree of power may be introduced into a free government which has its origin

in the people themselves than in any other form." And in this connection it may be now remarked that nowhere have organized risings or sudden riots against city government been punished with more terrible severity than in republics: witness Cavaignac's suppression of the Paris socialist rising in 1848, and that of the Commune in 1871, and the treatment of the New York mobs during the Irish religious riot called the Orangemen's Riot in 1871, as well as in that fearful uprising known as the Draft Riot of 1863. In those affairs of Paris and New York the numbers of victims have never been correctly stated, but they reached many thousands.

In 1826 Mr. Dix found the police force more remarkable for success in detection of crimes than for vigilance in preventing them. "Hardly a criminal in many years had not eluded justice." Today it is charged that the police compromise with crime and make an independent income from such compromises, a species of what we now call "graft," which means an illicit use of either public or private station.

It is interesting to recall that Mr. Dix noticed the constant tearing down of dwellings, but that he assigns no cause to this habit of New Yorkers. It is clear that this was owing to the individualism which has always characterized our citizens (as strongly marked today as one hundred years ago), and to the lack of capital for any alterations on a large scale, such as the vast changes made by Haussmann in Paris during the second empire, when whole sections went down at once and were replaced by the magnificent improvements that have made Paris today the gem of modern cities. Haussmann's work, be it remembered, was not performed on the outskirts of Paris, by the building of new suburbs, as we are now doing on an unprecedented scale, but in the city of Paris proper, the old city about the Louvre and the site of the Tuileries. Not for us to deny that the improvements at present projected in the Borough of the Bronx

are of the highest order, and made with far-reaching foresight; yet it cannot be forgotten that the lower end of Manhattan Island is one of the most charming spots for residence in the world, made agreeable in summer by the ocean breezes which blow in at night from the Narrows, and from the confluence of the waters at the Battery exempted from any long stay of snow. Strange to say that it has only been after great disasters, like the fire of 1835, that any great betterment has been made in lower New York. To such want of foresight, and perhaps to that ignorance which has characterized the rule of our masters since the great foreign immigration, we owe the absurd insufficiency of communication between New York and the shores of Long Island and New Jersey:—the failure to open Hudson Street to Broadway for relief of that thoroughfare, to widen Fulton Street as a highway for the travel from the Long Island ferry across the city to New Jersey, to complete the widening of Canal Street to the East River, and to open Madison Avenue to its natural junction with Broadway,—all of which are patent necessities for surface travel.

In 1827 "the carts were already innumerable on the streets," and indeed until the twentieth century came in there was no restriction to the use of the streets for trade. Thus unrestrained, the attractions of gay Broadway have always drawn to it even the heaviest trucks for the amusement of their teamsters, and the cab-drivers today prefer Broadway with its rail tracks to the unencumbered but quiet side avenues.

The increase in population up to 1800 was startling. From 1800 to 1810 the embargo incidental to the European wars brought an arrest of increase, incomers being few and outgoers many, so that while the census of the state showed a yearly growth that of the city displayed a marked diminishment. Looking backward and forward, Mr. Dix estimated that in 1875, fifty years after the time at which he was speaking, the population would be a million of souls

—a close prognostication, as the actual total of the city population in 1875 was 1,046,037; yet at the time when made an extravagant estimate perhaps, since he could not have foreseen the enormous Irish immigration, which did not set in until after the famine in Ireland of 1844, or the German inpour which followed the upheaval in Europe of 1848. Mr. Dix also considered that the whole island could not contain more than fourteen hundred thousand inhabitants; but again, he could not have anticipated the elevator, which, making tall buildings possible, has decupled the area for residence, so that even in 1900 the island of Manhattan had 1,801,739 inhabitants.

In 1827, of the twenty-five square miles of habitable surface, but one-sixth was occupied. In this connection it is interesting to note the opinions of the three commissioners, DeWitt, Morris, and Rutherford, who laid out the new city in 1807. They estimated that their plans for markets and public parks would be large enough to supply a population below Thirty-fourth Street of four hundred thousand souls. To their other forecasts they added: "It is not improbable that considerable numbers may be collected at Harlem before the hills to the southward of it shall be built upon as a city; and it is improbable that for centuries to come the grounds north of Harlem Flats will be covered with houses."

With relation to the internal resources of the city, Mr. Dix says that no details were to be had "except from incorporated and regularly organized establishments, and that all the rest was in a great degree the result of loose and uncertain conjecture." There were fourteen state banks, the Branch Bank of the United States, and a dry dock company, with banking privileges employing together a capital of \$17,450,000. There were eleven marine insurance companies with \$5,000,000, and thirty-eight fire insurance companies with \$12,450,000, and one savings-bank with \$600,392 deposits. The march of the century in similar institutions:

in 1800, \$6,000,000; in 1810, \$11,000,000; in 1827, \$39,600,392. The returns to congress from New York for the census of 1820 show the capital employed in manufactures at \$1,700,950, in steam engines at \$300,000, in sugar refineries at \$238,700, and in malt distilleries at \$185,000. The number of new buildings erected in New York in 1824 was fourteen hundred, of which all but seventy-six were dwellings; but there had been no enumeration for many years.

Here we must close our analysis of these two early and instructive papers. Of the later history of the progress of New York there have been no historic summaries whatever in the lines covered by Dix, except those made by the writer of these lines in 1876, after long and laborious researches. If apology be necessary for the copious extracts made from Mr. Dix's admirable paper, it must not be forgotten that his is the only authoritative account of the material progress of New York in the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

FORT SNELLING.

BY RETURN I. HOLCOMBE.

THE location and establishment of a military post at the confluence of the Minnesota and Mississippi rivers, in 1819, constituted the first permanent American occupation of Minnesota, and was therefore an important and influential event in the history of the state. A great part of the present area of the commonwealth—that portion lying generally east of the Mississippi—had belonged to the United States after the close of the war of the Revolution, and the larger part—that lying west of the river—had been American soil since the date of the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. As promptly as was practicable after the latter event, President Jefferson had sent the accomplished young Lieutenant Pike to spy out the land in the region of the headwaters of the Mississippi and make full report on the subject, and right thoroughly had that faithful and intelligent officer performed his duty and executed his instructions. The country then became known, though imperfectly, to America, but for many years afterward practically no Americans were among its inhabitants. The only Caucasians in the vast region were Englishmen and Frenchmen. In 1805 Lieutenant Pike had found the trading-posts in the extreme upper Mississippi country in charge of Englishmen, with the British flag over them, and he had caused the union jack to be hauled down and the stars and stripes substituted in its stead. All of the valuable fur trade, not only of Minnesota but of the entire northwest, was controlled by English cor-

porations—the great Hudson's Bay Company and the Northwest Fur Company.

By the terms of the Treaty of London, between the United States and Great Britain, in 1794, the English obtained the right of trade and intercourse with the Indians of the northern and northwestern portions of America. This valuable privilege gave them nearly a monopoly of the trade with the various tribes of the lakes and of the country about the headwaters of the Mississippi and the Missouri. In return for their license to occupy American soil, the traders were bound, by all moral obligation, at least, to obey the authority of the United States, abide by their laws, and commit no offense against their sovereignty and interests; but they failed in their duties most disgracefully and to the great injury of our country and its people. For during the War of 1812 every English trading-post in the northwest became a recruiting station for the British army, and every English trader became an active partisan for King George against our country. The most distressing occurrences and the greatest disasters to the Americans in the northern states and territories, while the war lasted, were occasioned by the conduct of the British traders. From northern Ohio and Michigan into Minnesota they recruited and organized numerous large bands of the most savage Indians, and either led them against the American forces or directed them upon the American frontier settlements. In the Minnesota country, Robert Dickson, the noted "red-headed Scotchman," as he was commonly termed—although he was actually born in England,—and his emissaries, induced members of the Sioux and Chippeways to violate the obligations of their treaty with Lieutenant Pike and join the British forces in warfare against the Americans. The Minnesota Indians, recruited and organized by Dickson, served the British at the capture of Mackinaw and of Prairie du Chien in the fight against Colonel Zack Taylor at the Rock Island, and also in southern Michigan and northern Ohio.

A company of Sioux, commanded by Duncan Graham, a prominent Minnesota trader, were in the battle of Lower Sandusky, or Fort Stephenson, in northern Ohio in 1813, when the British forces were so signally repulsed by the brave Lieutenant Crogham and his men.

The evil conduct of these ungrateful and unprincipled traders became known to the American authorities, and, indeed, to history. To prevent its repetition measures were adopted as promptly as possible. And so by the Treaty of Ghent, which terminated the War of 1812, and which was made December 24, 1814, the right of English traders to remain or traffic in the United States was not given; our country wanted no more of them. In 1816 congress enacted a law which authorized the president to prohibit all foreigners from trading with the Indians within our limits. Under that act instructions were given to all Indian agents to prevent this form of British aggression and trespass, since it was manifest that the act was aimed almost directly at the English subjects in Canada.

But the strong-nerved traders refused to abandon their posts and traffic at the mere proclamation of the law or the polite requests of the American authorities. It was obvious that more stringent and effective measures must be adopted. Without a military force properly established and distributed along or near the northern boundary of our country, the illegal trade would still be continued. And even if the actual trading operations were prevented, an unwholesome and most pernicious practice would still remain unless forcibly prevented. This was the custom of frequent "talks" at the British posts between the Indians of the United States and His Britannic Majesty's subjects, which affairs were always accompanied by a profuse distribution of presents and British flags and medals among the savages and by other means of winning and increasing their regard for Englishmen and of promoting their dislike for Americans.

The American military authorities were prompt to move. Military posts, with garrisons, were established along the Great Lakes within a comparatively short time after the close of the War of 1812. The secretary of war, during nearly all of the second administration of President Monroe, was the able, accomplished, and distinguished John C. Calhoun.¹ Earnest and radical by reason of his intense nature, whatever this distinguished statesman ever found to do he did with all his might. At the period of his incumbency of the war office he was in the prime of his manhood exercising what authority he possessed in developing every section of the union. He not only increased the efficiency of the army, but improved the conditions of the Indians and caused the power of the United States to be felt in remote regions where before it had not even been acknowledged. He was as great a stickler for the delegated powers of the federal government, as he conceived them, as he subsequently was for the reserved rights of the states, as he comprehended them.

February 10, 1819, Secretary Calhoun ordered the concentration of the Fifth Regiment of infantry at Detroit, with a view to its transportation by way of the lakes and the Fox and Wisconsin rivers to Prairie du Chien. After leaving a garrison at the last named point the other companies were to proceed up the Mississippi to the mouth of the St. Peter's river, and establish a new military post which should become the headquarters of the Fifth Regiment. Other orders, issued about the same time, directed the movement of troops up the Missouri and the establishment of a fort at "the Council Bluff" on the Missouri, at the mouth of the Yellowstone, and at the "Falls of St. Mary's," now called the Sault Ste. Marie.

In a letter to the chairman of the house committee of military affairs, dated December 29, 1819, Secretary Cal-

¹Lake Calhoun, near Minneapolis, was named for this great American. (See Neill's History, p. 338).

houn announced that "the posts at the mouth of the St. Peter's and at the Council Bluff have already been occupied, and that at the Mandan village [at the mouth of the Yellowstone] will probably be next summer." Of the first named establishment the secretary said:

"The post at the mouth of the St. Peter's is at the head of navigation on the Mississippi, and, in addition to its commanding position in relation to the Indians, it possesses great advantages, either to protect our trade or to prevent that of foreigners."

Of the intercourse between the British traders and the American Indians Mr. Calhoun said:

"This intercourse is the great source of danger to our peace, and until it is stopped our frontier cannot be safe. It is estimated that upwards of three thousand Indians from our side of the lakes visited Malden and Durmond's Island last year, and that, at the latter place alone, presents were distributed to them to the amount of \$95,000. . . . The occupation of the contemplated posts will put into our hands the power to correct this evil. . . . On the Mississippi and the Missouri the posts at the St. Peter's and the Mandan village are well selected for the same service. From the Lake of the Woods westwardly the forty-ninth parallel of latitude is the boundary established by the late convention between the United States and the British possessions. The Hudson Bay and the Northwest companies have several posts and trading establishments much to the south of this line, and, consequently, within our territory. When the boundary is definitely ascertained and marked, the policy of the act of 29th of April, 1816, may, by means of these facts, be effectually enforced; and therefore, in that quarter, as well as on our side of the lakes, we will have the power to exclude foreigners from trade and intercourse with the Indians residing within our limits."

It is plain that the prime and principal object of the establishment of the military post which has long been called Fort Snelling was to bring the British traders under subjection, and either to compel them to renounce allegiance to the English crown and become citizens of the United States, or else drive them from the country, and also to prevent others of their class from coming in and establishing themselves, a trespass and invasion no longer to be tolerated.²

²Neill, in his "History of Minnesota," chapter xvi., p. 319, intimates that the founding of Lord Selkirk's colony in the Lake Winnipeg region and the

The detachments of the Fifth Regiment to be sent to the upper Mississippi under the order of the secretary of war of February 10, 1819, were commanded by Lieutenant-Colonel Henry Leavenworth, and no better selection for the work could have been made.³ He was intelligent, enterprising, and ambitious, and so was always active and diligent about his duties.

October 16, 1818, all that portion of Illinois Territory not now included within the state of that name, but forming a part of Wisconsin, was attached to Michigan. In the spring of 1819 the county of Crawford, which included a large part of what is now the southeastern part of Minnesota, was, by an act of the Michigan legislature, organized, with the county seat at Prairie du Chien. Colonel Leavenworth, leading his troops on their way to build the Minnesota post, brought blank commissions to Prairie du Chien for the first county officers of the new county of Crawford, and was ordered to take charge of the county's organization, install the new officers, etc. It was with some difficulty that suitable persons to fill the offices were found.

Having established garrisons at Fort Crawford, at Prairie du Chien, and Fort Armstrong, on Rock Island, and having set the wheels of the government of Crawford

lower Red River of the North was the chief reason for the establishment of the fort; but the official records in the case, on the testimony of the secretary of war himself, prove that the post was established to enable the government to dispose of the British traders effectually and to handle the Indians properly. No mention is made by Secretary Calhoun of the Selkirk colony.

³General Henry Leavenworth was born in Connecticut, December 10, 1783. In early life he was a lawyer and was engaged in the practice of his profession upon the breaking out of the War of 1812. In that year he entered the army as a captain in the Twenty-fifth Infantry, and the following year was promoted to major. He was brevetted lieutenant-colonel and colonel for distinguished services in the battles of Chippewa and Bridgewater (near Niagara Falls, where he was wounded), and was appointed lieutenant-colonel of the Fifth Infantry in February, 1818. In 1824 he was made a brevet brigadier-general and in 1825 colonel of the Third Infantry. He established various frontier military posts, one of which, at the site of the city of Leavenworth, Kan., perpetuates his name. He died at Cross Timbers, Tex., in July, 1834.

County in motion, Colonel Leavenworth started up the Mississippi to complete his work at the mouth of the St. Peter's. The troops of the expedition numbered "ninety-eight rank and file." They were in fourteen batteaux or keel boats and were accompanied by twenty hired boatmen; thus the entire force numbered one hundred and eighteen men. The flotilla was quite imposing. Besides the batteaux, which served as troop-ships, there were two large boats loaded with provisions, ordnance, and other stores, the barge of Colonel Leavenworth and the boat of Major Forsyth, making a fleet in all of eighteen boats, which were propelled by sails and by oars and poles.

The expedition set out from Prairie du Chien at eight o'clock on Sunday morning, August 8, and arrived at the mouth of the St. Peter's on Tuesday morning, August 24,⁴ making the trip of two hundred and thirty-four miles, by the river, in sixteen days, at an average progress of twenty miles a day.

From Fort Dearborn (Chicago) the baggage had been hauled in wagons drawn by horses and oxen, and a number of cows were brought along; but it became necessary, on account of lack of proper transportation, to have all these animals brought by land from Prairie du Chien to the St. Peter's, and this was done by Jean Baptiste Faribault and family. Of the cattle, however, only the cows were brought. At Prairie du Chien Colonel Leavenworth was joined by Major Thomas Forsyth, a special Indian agent, who had been sent up from St. Louis in charge of the provisions, etc., for the troops to be stationed at the St. Peter's, and "a quantity of goods, say \$2,000 worth," to be delivered to the Sioux in payment for the lands ceded by them to the United States under the Pike treaty of 1806. As stated, he

⁴Neill, p. 320, and Williams ("History of St. Paul," p. 39) give this date as September 24, an error of one month. (Taliaferro, vol. ii., Minnesota History Society Collectors, p. 103, gives the date of the arrival at the St. Peter's as September 17). The correct dates are derived from Forsyth's Journal.

joined Colonel Leavenworth at Fort Crawford and accompanied the expedition to the St. Peter's.

Major Forsyth kept a daily journal of his trip from St. Louis to the St. Peter's and return. This important manuscript was secured from his son, Colonel Robert Forsyth of St. Louis, in 1871, by Dr. Lyman C. Draper, and published in the Wisconsin Historical Collections, of which he (Dr. Draper) was editor, and was reprinted in volume iii. of the Minnesota Historical Society Collections. From this journal the incidents of the voyage of Colonel Leavenworth to Minnesota have, in the main, been obtained.

The Sioux had somehow learned that an agent of their American Father was on his way with presents for them, and on the arrival of Major Forsyth at Prairie du Chien, July 5, he found the son of Chief Red Wing, with a considerable band, awaiting him. Young Red Wing at once began begging for goods. He said a member of his band had recently been killed by the Chippewas, and on this account the hearts of himself and his companions were very sad, and therefore the major should at once give them goods to assuage their grief and lighten the gloom of their bereavement. "But all this," writes Major Forsyth, "was a mere begging speech. I told him that I meant to go up with the troops to the River St. Peter's, and on my way up I would stop at their different villages, where I would speak to them and give them a few goods, but that I could not give any goods at this place. Yet he is such a beggar that he would not take any refusal. I got up in an abrupt manner and left him and his band to study awhile." A week later the major writes: "The Red Wing's son is still here abegging," and not until the 15th, after a stay of ten days, did he leave for home, to Forsyth's great relief. But in the meanwhile old Wabashaw, he of one eye, whose big village was near the present site of Winona, had arrived, and a week later old Red Wing himself, with twenty followers from their village, where the city of Red Wing now

stands, had come. "This is another begging expedition," writes Major Forsyth.

Two days out from Prairie du Chien the expedition stopped on the Iowa side at the temporary village of Tah-ma-ha, the Pike Fish.⁵ Him Major Forsyth gave some powder and also some "milk," as the major calls the whiskey, which he assures us was necessary to give to all Indians to completely satisfy them.

On the 13th the village of Chief Wabasha (then often called "the Leaf") was reached, near the present site of Winona, upon what was long known as Wabasha's Prairie. A landing was made and Major Forsyth gave a long talk to the chief, assuring him of the pacific and benevolent intentions of the members of the expedition and of all Americans generally.

"I told him," writes the major, "that the president of the United States had sent me to acquaint the Sioux that the troops he saw encamped on the island were sent up to build a fort at the mouth of the River St. Peter's; that he must not think that anything bad was intended; that the fort would be a place where any little thing they wanted repaired by the blacksmith would be attended to, and it would also be a place of trade; that their enemies would not be allowed to injure any of the Sioux at or near the fort, but, at the same time, the Sioux must not injure any of the Chippewas that might visit it. 'And here [pointing to Colonel Leavenworth] is the chief of the soldiers belonging to your Great Father, and if at any time any of his young men do anything wrong to you, complain to him.' "

⁵According to Taliaferro, Minnesota History Society Collection, vol. vi., p. 197. Other writers identify this Indian as Ta-mah-hah (accent on second syllable), or the Rising Moose, mentioned by Pike as "my friend," and who was ever the faithful ally of all Americans. Tah-ma-ha (accent on first syllable) and Ta-mah-hah were both prominent Indian characters, and owing to the similarity of the English spelling of their names their identity has been often confused. Dr. Thomas Foster, a very high authority, considered the two names as meaning the same man. (See Neill, p. 287, *et seq.*)

Major Forsyth took especial pains to impress upon the chief and his followers that the Americans were very numerous and powerful and must not be trifled with, although their Great Father had forgotten that many of Wabasha's band had assisted the British during the War of 1812. Concluding, the major said to Wabasha: "Here is a blanket, a pipe of tobacco, and some powder. This present is but little, but you well know that I have many children to see before I return home, and I must give a little to every one." "He accepted of the presents with thanks," says Major Forsyth, "and after sundown he came aboard of my boat and conversed with me on many subjects. This man is no beggar, nor does he drink, and perhaps I may say that he is the only man in the Sioux nation of this description."

Lake Pepin was "crossed with ease" on the 18th, and the next morning Major Forsyth had "a little talk" with Chief Red Wing at his village. "I gave him some goods. He was much pleased with his presents. His son [whom the major encountered at Prairie du Chien] is exactly what I took him to be—a trifling, begging, discontented fellow." This day, after making twenty-four miles, the expedition encamped at the mouth of the St. Croix, which is described as "a larger river." On the evening of the 20th a landing was made at Medicine Wood, probably near Gray Cloud Island. The journal says: "Medicine Wood takes its name from a large beech tree, which kind of wood the Sioux are unacquainted with, supposing that the Great Spirit placed it there as a genius to protect or punish them according to their deserts." This is the first and perhaps the only recorded instance of the existence of a beech tree in Minnesota, and it might therefore properly have a "medicine" character, that term being Sioux for the supernatural or deeply mysterious.⁶

⁶Beltrami, in his "Pilgrimage," vol. ii., p. 197, notes the Medicine Wood, and says: "This is a beech, a tree unknown in these countries, and which the savages venerate as a god."

On the 21st, Major Forsyth, in his boat, and Colonel Leavenworth, in his barge, going ahead of the main fleet, landed at the village of Little Crow, in the vicinity of the present State Fish Hatchery, in the eastern confines of St. Paul. The real name of this chieftain was Che-tan Wah-koota Manne, or the Walking Hunting Hawk. Little Crow was, in effect, but the royal title which he assumed upon taking the chieftainship of his band. His father and his grandfather, according to Long, were each named Little Crow. This was the grandfather of Tah O-yah-ta Dootah, the Little Crow of 1862 and of notorious memory generally.

At the time of the visit of Major Forsyth and Colonel Leavenworth, Little Crow had but a small band, of about seventy warriors, and in all about three hundred men, women, and children. They dwelt in very comfortable cabins or shacks, with palisaded walls of tamarack poles, and the roofs were of brush, covered with bark. The chief had a large cabin, some thirty feet in length, divided into two rooms. The cabins were all clustered and snuggled against the rocky bluffs in the eastern limits of St. Paul, in the vicinity of the present State Fish Hatchery. In summer the band, or many of its members, temporarily occupied tepees upon the summits of the bluffs, on the present site of Indian Mounds Park.

Forsyth and Leavenworth had an interview and "a talk" with Little Crow, and Forsyth writes: "His independent manner I like. I made him a very handsome present, for which he was very thankful, and said it was more than he expected."

Head winds forced the fleet to remain at Little Crow's village (called Kapogha) the greater part of two days. But on Monday, August 23, at 4 P. M., Forsyth arrived at the mouth of the St. Peter's, and the following day was joined by Colonel Leavenworth in his barge, the other boats arriving later. As has been stated, the boats were propelled by poles, oars, and sails. They were called *batteaux* by the

French and "Mackinaw boats" by the English and Americans, because of their first use by the traders of Michilimackinac. Each boat carried a large sail mounted amidship. The sail was serviceable on the lakes, but rarely of utility on the river, and was often a hindrance because of contrary winds. Upon landing, Colonel Leavenworth lost no time in setting about his duties. Forsyth says:

"Tuesday, August 24. This morning Colonel Leavenworth arrived in his barge and was busily employed almost all day in finding a proper place to make an establishment. He at length pitched on a place immediately at the mouth of St. Peter's River, on its right bank, where, on the arrival of the soldiers, they were immediately set to work in making roads up the bank of the river, cutting down trees, etc."

The first tree on the camping ground was felled by Daniel W. Hubbard, one of the soldiers. In a comparatively short time, ample quarters, all log cabins, had been prepared for the accommodation of the troops then present, and the work of clearing the ground was continued in anticipation of the imminent arrival of a considerable number of recruits known to be en route.

The expedition did not arrive in very good condition. Major Forsyth writes:

"Colonel Leavenworth set out from Prairie du Chien with ninety-eight men, and on his arrival at the St. Peter's upwards of one-half were sick. These men were only sixteen days on the water, but let any man travel in a boat on the Mississippi for a considerable time, during a very warm summer, drinking very bad water, sleeping out in the dews to avoid being devoured by mosquitoes, and getting but little rest during the short nights, and then say that such hardships are not sufficient to ruin the constitution of any man. It must be people who have been bred to the like who are able to withstand and overcome such hardships."

En route, at the mouth of the Ouiscensin River, the wife of Lieutenant Nathan Clark gave birth to a daughter, who was christened Charlotte Ouiscensin Clark and is now Mrs. Charlotte O. Van Cleve and still a resident of Minnesota.

On the evening of the next day after his arrival, Major Forsyth was visited by Pinichow and White Turkey, two Sioux sub-chiefs, and a number of their followers, whose vil-

lages were a few miles up the Minnesota. They were eager for their presents, which they knew the major had for them, and although it was late when they arrived they importuned him to begin the work of distribution at once. They were sent away and told to return the following day, "when, after a long talk," says Major Forsyth, "I gave each of them a very handsome present, and they returned home, apparently satisfied."

The Indians of the neighborhood fairly swarmed in for their presents. On the 26th came three sub-chiefs, each with his band, viz: Shakopay, or Six, whose village was thirty miles up the St. Peter's, where the city of Shakopee now stands; the Arrow, whose village was twenty-four miles above Shakopay's, and the Red Eagle, whose village was six miles above Arrow's. "I gave them the remainder of my goods," writes Major Forsyth, "yet the Six wanted more. I found, on inquiring, that Mr. Six is a good-for-nothing fellow and rather gives bad counsel to his men than otherwise." In his letter to Governor William Clark of the then Missouri Territory, the major says that Chief Six "clamored for presents, and rather ordered than requested that I would write on to the Great Father, the president, to send him plenty of kettles, guns, etc. He is, as I am informed, a troublesome, good-for-nothing fellow." "In all my talks with the Indians at the St. Peter's," writes Major Forsyth, "I generally told them the same that I had told the Leaf (meaning Chief Wabasha) and in all cases I had to give each band a little whiskey. These are the last Indians I am to see in this quarter; therefore, I am done with the Sioux for this year."

On Saturday, August 28, a party composed of Colonel Leavenworth, Major Forsyth, Major Josiah Vose, Surgeon Purcell, Lieutenant Nathan Clark, the wife of Captain George Gooding, and an escort of soldiers, visited the Falls of St. Anthony. The excursion was made in Major Forsyth's boat, which was manned by the soldiers.

The appearance and character of the Falls at that time are thus described by Major Forsyth:

" . . . The sight to me was beautiful; the white sheet of water falling perpendicularly, as I should suppose about twenty feet, over the different precipices; in other parts rolls of water, at different distances, falling like so many silver cords, while about the island large bodies of water were rushing through great blocks of rocks, tumbling every way, as if determined to make war against anything that dared to approach them. After viewing the Falls from the prairie for some time, we approached nearer, and by the time we got up to the Falls the noise of the falling water appeared to me to be awful. I sat down on the bank and feasted my eyes, for a considerable time, in viewing the falling waters and the rushing of large torrents through and among the broken and large blocks of rocks thrown in every direction by some great convulsion of nature. Several of the company crossed over to the island above the Falls, the water being shallow. Having returned from the Island, they told me that they had attempted to cross over the channel on the other side of the island, but that the water was too deep; they say the greatest quantity of water descends on the other [northeast] side of the island."

Concerning the personnel of the members of this excursion party, it is to be said that Major Josiah H. Vose was a Massachusetts man who served as captain and major during the War of 1812, and at its close in 1815 was appointed captain and brevet major in the Fifth Infantry. He died at New Orleans in 1845 as colonel of the Fourth Regular Infantry. Dr. Edward Purcell was a Virginian, who had been appointed surgeon of the Fifth Infantry in 1818, and became post surgeon at "Fort St. Anthony" in the following year. He died at Fort Snelling January 11, 1825. Lieutenant Nathan Clark was a Massachusetts man, who had served in the regular army during the War of 1812 and was post commissary at Fort Snelling for eight years. He died at Fort Winnebago, Wis., in 1836, having attained the rank of major. Mrs. Gooding was the first white woman to see St. Anthony Falls. Colonel Leavenworth and Major Forsyth have heretofore been sketched.

On the 29th Major Forsyth and Colonel Leavenworth went up the "Minnesota" to the villages of Pinichon and White Turkey to buy horses, but found that the Indians had

but few, and none to sell. The next day Major Forsyth set out on his return to St. Louis. He was accompanied by Colonel Leavenworth as far as the upper end of Lake Pepin, where he met the long expected recruits, one hundred and twenty in number. Major Forsyth writes:

"Wednesday, September 1. This morning we heard the report of a cannon on the other side of an island. The colonel [Leavenworth], who was on board of my boat, said that those must be the expected recruits. We immediately weighed anchor and ascended to the upper part of the island to get into the other channel and head off the boats. We met two large boats and a batteau with one hundred and twenty recruits on board."

With the re-enforcement of the recruits the troops at the St. Peter's consisted of two hundred and eighteen men, rank and file. While this was not a very formidable force, it was sufficient to enforce the authority of the United States in this quarter, and their commander was determined to do his duty.

Look to yourselves, Englishmen! You who have so long remained in the Minnesota country in defiance of and covert hostility against American authority, are called to account. No longer may you, unmolested and undisturbed, carry on your illegal traffic and stir up sedition and incite ill will among the red men against their American Father and his people. You must cast off your allegiance to Great Britain and become loyal American citizens, or you must leave the country and stand not upon the order of your going.

One interesting item in connection with the founding of Fort Snelling is that the transportation of troops from Detroit to the St. Peter's cost the government less than would have their maintenance in quarters at Detroit for the same length of time. The secretary of war presents this comparison: The total cost of the transportation of troops and stores and of the means of transportation, boats, teams, etc., was \$43,568.16, while the expenses of the troops, had they remained at their former station, would have been

\$39,384, and the value of the boats, etc., was \$5,000, making a total of \$44,384, or a balance in favor of the expedition of \$815.84.

Colonel Leavenworth called his first cantonment, or establishment, New Hope. There was a great propriety in the name, for it was the foundation of a new hope for the country and the opening of a new era for its improvement and general welfare. Cantonment New Hope was on the flat land, on the south bank of the St. Peter's, half a mile from its mouth. Practically it was at the confluence of the St. Peter's and the Mississippi—at the meeting of the waters, or "Mine-dota," as the Indians called it. The quarters were all log cabins, and their building, which was prosecuted through the fall months, was a work of hardship and difficulty. The logs were cut in the surrounding forests, and as there were no teams to haul them they had to be carried, often at a considerable distance, by the men. Stone had to be quarried and shaped for chimneys and fireplaces, wells dug, and a hospital constructed, involving hard and toilsome labor.

The winter of 1819-20 was very cold and was severely felt by many of the men, who had never before lived in this latitude. In December there came upon the garrison a dire visitation which became fairly a calamity. Scurvy broke out among the troops and grew very virulent in its form and fatal in its effects. It assumed the character of an epidemic, and as it progressed nearly every man was stricken. Before it had passed, according to Major Taliaferro, forty men had died. How many became invalided and were forced to leave the service is not known. At one period the plague was so prevalent that for several days garrison duty was suspended, there being barely well men enough in the command to attend to the sick and the interment of the dead. When the disease entered upon its last stage its fatal termination was often very sudden. Soldiers who were in apparently good health when they retired at night were

found dead in their beds the next morning. Joseph R. Brown, who was a drummer boy of the garrison at the time, writes that on one occasion a plague-smitten soldier, who was on sentinel duty ("two hours on and two hours off post"), upon being temporarily relieved, stretched himself on a bench in the guard-room and, four hours later, when he was called to resume his post, he was dead. The fate of the poor victims of the epidemic was sad, but most honorable. They passed away on a remote frontier, amid a wilderness and under circumstances of privation and general distress, and were buried in obscure and lonely graves whose location has long been unknown. But they were American soldiers and died in the service of their country, and there can be no more glorious death. The possession of the country demanded sacrifices, and these gallant spirits were the first martyrs to the cause of the development and civilization of Minnesota and the northwest.

Colonel Leavenworth and Surgeon Purcell made every possible effort to arrest the disease, and finally succeeded by administering spruce tea and other vegetable decoctions. Vinegar and other anti-scorbutics were also procured from Prairie du Chien by runners sent down for them. There were no vegetables in the commissary department, and the rations were pickled pork, beans, bread, and "small hominy," or coarsely cracked corn, with a little rice and molasses. Coffee was not then used. Occasionally fresh meat, of the wild game of the region, was bought from the Indians or obtained by hunting. General Sibley was of the opinion, from what he learned from Joseph R. Brown and others, who were members of the garrison, that the disease was caused by the bad quality of the provisions, especially of the pork, which had been spoiled by the villainy of the contractors and their agents. To lighten the weight of the heavy barrels of mess pork and make their transportation in the keel boats from St. Louis easier, the rascals, upon setting out, drew off the brine; but, before delivering

them at St. Peter's, refilled them with river water, and the fraud was not detected until the scamps had made their departure from the country. As a result, the meat became of very bad quality and fairly poisoned the systems of those who ate it.

In the spring of 1820 Colonel Leavenworth began the erection of the permanent post on the high plateau on the north side of the Minnesota, where it is still situated. In the month of May he removed his command to the crest of the Mississippi bluff, a little to the northward of the site selected for the post and convenient to a spring which furnished a bountiful and excellent supply of pure water. From this circumstance the colonel called his new encampment Camp Coldwater. The men were quartered in tents during the spring and summer, but spent the late fall and winter months in their former log cabins at New Hope.

Meanwhile the construction of the buildings which were to comprise the new fort went on. September 10 of this year (1820) the cornerstone of the commandant's quarters, commonly termed the cornerstone of the fort, was laid. The previous spring the horses and cows left by Colonel Leavenworth at Prairie du Chien were brought up by Jean B. Fairbault, the well-known trader, and became of much service to the garrison. In August Colonel Leavenworth, who had been transferred to another regiment (the Sixth Infantry) and ordered to the southwest, turned over the command of the post to his superior, Colonel Josiah Snelling, the commander of the Fifth Regiment, who had been ordered to the post to complete it.⁷

⁷Colonel Josiah Snelling was born in Massachusetts in 1782. He entered the army in 1808 as first lieutenant. The following year he was promoted to captain. He served with credit at the battle of Tippecanoe in 1811, and during the War of 1812 was quite distinguished. For gallantry in action at Brounstown he was brevetted major. In 1818 he was made lieutenant-colonel and in the following year became colonel of the Fifth U. S. Infantry. He completed the post at the St. Peter's, which was named for him in 1824 by General Scott. In the summer of 1827 Colonel Snelling and his regiment were ordered from Fort Snelling to St. Louis, and in August of that year, while temporarily in Washington, the colonel died of brain fever.

Philander Prescott, who came to the St. Peter's cantonment in the winter of 1819-20, as clerk for the sutler, a Mr. Devotion of Detroit, and who passed the rest of his life in Minnesota, did valuable service for history in writing his reminiscences of early days in the northwest while he was in full recollection of them. He wrote in 1861 and was murdered by the Sioux in the great outbreak of 1862. His manuscript was printed in volume vi. of the Minnesota Historical Society Collections, pp. 475, *et seq.* Mr. Prescott was a young man of nineteen when he came to the country, having been born at Phelpstown, N. Y., in 1801, but he had a good education and was always clearheaded, intelligent, and reliable.

According to Mr. Prescott, who was on the ground at the time, there was not much done toward the building of the fort in the summer of 1820. A few soldiers were employed in cutting trees and hewing timber, which was hauled to the site selected. This site, as chosen by Colonel Leavenworth, was three hundred yards west of the one finally determined upon and where the fort was constructed. Although the buildings of the post were to be mainly of logs, a considerable quantity of boards and other sawed lumber was needed. The first lot of this material used was cut with whipsaws, worked by two men to each saw.

It was determined to build a sawmill in the vicinity, and as steam was not in use for the machinery of a mill at that time, the motive power had to be water. It was necessary to find a suitable site for a mill. An examination of the "little falls" or Brown's Fall (now called Minnehaha) was made, but as the little stream which furnishes the water for the cataract was very low that summer, and could not be depended upon to furnish a sufficient volume of water, a certain site at the great St. Anthony Falls, on the west bank of the river, was selected. In his autobiography, printed in volume vi. of the Minnesota Historical Society's Collections, Prescott says:

"An officer and some men had been sent up Rum River to examine the pine and see if it could be got to the river by hand. The party returned and made a favorable report, and in the winter (1820-1) a party was sent to cut pine logs and to raft them down in the spring. They brought down about two thousand logs by hand. Some ten or fifteen men would haul on a sled one log, from one-fourth to one-half a mile, and lay it upon the bank of Rum River. In the spring, when the stream broke up, the logs were rolled into the river and floated down to the entrance of Rum River into the Mississippi, where they were formed into small rafts and floated down to the falls. In the summer, or early fall, Colonel Leavenworth was ordered to the Missouri River. The plans for the fort had been prepared by him, but were somewhat altered by Colonel Snelling, who moved the location to the present site. The sawmill was commenced in the fall and winter of 1820-1 and finished in 1822, and a large quantity of lumber was made for the whole fort and for all the furniture and outbuildings. All the logs were brought to the mill or the landing by hand, and hauled from the landing to the mill by teams. The lumber, when sawed, was hauled from the mill to the fort by the teams. Lieutenant William E. Kruger lived [at the mill?] and had charge of the mill party."

The tract of Rum River timber, where some of the logs mentioned were cut, was presumably about four miles north of Cambridge, Isanti County, near a small stream. Daniel Stanchfield, the pioneer lumberman, who was on the ground in 1847-8, writes:

"I logged there two years, which was the first lumbering upon a large scale on Rum River. A part of the lumber for building Fort Snelling, however, had been cut on the same lake; for we found on its shores the remains of an old logging camp which had been there many years. In its vicinity pine trees had been cut and taken away, and the stumps had partially decayed. Logging had also been done at the same early date in the 'Dutchman's Grove.'"

The sawmill was completed in 1821. It was equipped with a quick-acting upright saw, known among lumbermen as a muley saw. The area of the mill was about fifty by seventy feet. It stood on the west bank of the river, now the center of the great milling district of Minneapolis.

In 1823, near the sawmill, a gristmill was completed. Colonel Snelling was experimenting in grain-growing. He had sown a field of wheat and planted a considerable corn-field, with the view of obtaining fresh breadstuffs for his troops. To aid in the enterprise the commissary of sub-

sistence at St. Louis, by order of the commissary-general at Washington, sent to Colonel Snelling a pair of buhr millstones, 337 pounds of plaster of Paris, and two dozen sickles, all of the value of \$288.33. The little gristmill was only about sixteen or eighteen feet square. Colonel Snelling's venture in grain-raising was fairly successful, but the wheat, which presumably was threshed with flails, was not properly taken care of. Mrs. Ann Adams writes:

"Colonel Snelling had sown some wheat that season [1823], and had it ground at a mill which the government had built at the falls, but the wheat had become mouldy or sprouted, and made wretched, black, bitter-tasting bread. This was issued to the troops, who got mad because they could not eat it and brought it to the parade-ground and threw it down there. Colonel Snelling came out and remonstrated with them. There was much inconvenience that winter—1823-4—on account of the scarcity of provisions."

The gristmill was operated by the military authorities in a sort of desultory way until in 1849, when it was sold for \$750 to Robert Smith of Illinois, by whom it was rented to Calvin A. Tuttle, who operated it until 1855. According to the *Minnesota Pioneer* of February 20, 1850, during the season of 1849 there were four thousand bushels of corn ground here for the Indian trade and the settlers, "and about the same quantity remains to be ground." The saw-mill was then undergoing repairs in preparation for its operation the following season.

Upon the completion of the fort, Colonel Snelling named it Fort St. Anthony, presumably for its proximity to St. Anthony Falls. In 1824 General Winfield Scott, then the inspector-general of the American army, while on a general tour of inspection and observation, visited the post and remained some days. He was so impressed with the efficiency of the work that upon his return to Washington he recommended that the fort be named in honor of its commander, and it was so ordered by the secretary of war, and ever since the post has been called Fort Snelling. Regarding the change in name, General Scott, in his report to the war department, said:

"This work, of which the war department is in possession of a plan, reflects the highest credit on Colonel Snelling, his officers, and his men. The defenses and, for the most part, the public storehouses, shops, and quarters, being constructed of stone, the whole is likely to endure as long as the post shall remain a frontier one. The cost of erection to the government has been the amount paid for tools and iron and the per diem paid to soldiers employed as mechanics. I wish to suggest to the general-in-chief, and through him to the war department, the propriety of calling this work Fort Snelling, as a just compliment to the meritorious officer under whom it has been erected. The present name [Fort St. Anthony] is foreign to all our associations, and is, besides, geographically incorrect, as the work stands at the junction of the Mississippi and St. Peter's rivers, eight miles (*sic*) below the great falls of the Mississippi called after St. Anthony."

Colonel Snelling had built the fort in the form of a lozenge, because of the shape of the site, lying in the angle formed by the junction of the two rivers. The first row of barracks was of logs; the other buildings were of stone. Many years later all the buildings were surrounded by a high stone wall.

In March, 1819, Secretary Calhoun appointed Lawrence Taliaferro,⁸ a recent lieutenant in the army, "agent of Indian Affairs at St. Peter's, near the Falls of St. Anthony." With the permanent establishment of the post would come the permanent supervision of the Indian tribes

⁸Lawrence Taliaferro, who was Indian agent at Fort Snelling from the fall of 1819 to January, 1840, was prominently identified with and a leading character of early Minnesota history. He was a native of Virginia, of remote Italian ancestry, and was born February 24, 1794. He served in the regular army during the War of 1812, with the rank of lieutenant, and when, at the close of the war, the army was reduced to a peace footing, he was retained in service. He resigned from the army to become Indian agent. On retiring from the agency he went to his home, at Bedford, Pa., where in 1857 he was appointed United States military storekeeper and held the position until 1863, when he resigned and was placed on the retired list, "for long and faithful service to the republic." He died at Bedford, January 22, 1871, aged seventy-seven. He left in Minnesota a half-blood Sioux daughter, named Mary, whom he always recognized and who married Warren Woodbury, afterward a citizen of St. Paul. During the entire time of his service at Fort Snelling Major Taliaferro kept a minute diary of events in the quarter, and his journal is in the possession of the Minnesota Historical Society. In 1864 he wrote an autobiography, which appears in volume vi. of the Society's Collections. Concluding his sketch, he writes of himself as "One that has uniformly tried to do his duty to God and his fellow man. . . . A member of the order of F. and A. Masons; a deacon in the old school Presbyterian Church of Bedford, Pa., in good standing; placed by the president, in August 1863, on the retired list of the army, and now [1864] in his seventy-first year."

in this quarter by the government and the maintenance of its authority generally. Major Taliaferro's selection as the government's agent was well justified by the results. He was scrupulously honest himself, and demanded that everybody else should be. He soon had great influence over the Indians and managed them well. Uniformly he gratified their penchant for "big talks" or councils, and was otherwise considerate of their wishes, but at the same time he impressed them with proper respect for the American government and a friendly regard for its citizens. He had inordinate self-esteem and was sometimes ridiculed or denounced for his egotism; but this weakness kept him honest, upright, and faithful; he was too proud of himself to do anything dishonorable or ignoble. His personal accomplishments were many, and his journal and other writings have been of great service to northwestern history.

September 12, 1821, the year following the murder of Andrew and Poupin, a party of Sissetous came down to the fort, and the leader said to Agent Taliaferro:

"We are glad to find your door open to-day, my Father. The Indians, you see, are like the wolves of the prairie. When they stop at night they lie down in the open air and rise with the sun and pursue their journey.' I applied for the other murderer of the white men of the Missouri, but in bringing him down the fear of being hung induced him to stab himself to death."

The building of Fort Snelling was an epochal event in the civilization of Minnesota. The fort was a base of operations for the exercise and maintenance of American authority over the country, and became the nucleus of settlement and development. Here were established the first institutions of enlightenment. Here the first church services were held and the first school was taught. It was the support of missionaries and the rendezvous and resting-place of travelers and explorers.

With Fort Snelling as a center, the avenues of development were opened and radiated, and from its gateways the roadways of progress flowed. In plain sight from the bat-

tlements of its historic round tower the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis were laid out. It was long the head of Mississippi River navigation and the prominent northern commercial terminal. It was practically the headquarters and point of approach of the forces that, whether armed with guns and swords or plowshares and pruning-hooks, destroyed barbarism, established civilization in its stead, and made the wilderness blossom as a rose.

THE MORRIS FAMILY OF MORRISANIA.

BY W. W. SPOONER.

(Continued from p. 44.)

III.

LEWIS MORRIS, eldest son of Hon. Lewis and Isabella (Graham) Morris, was born at Trenton, N. J., September 23, 1698. At the age of twenty-four he entered public life as a member of the council of Governor Burnet, with whom he appears to have served on terms of good understanding. But under Governor Montgomerie, Burnet's successor, his career in the council came to an abrupt end, owing to dissensions which arose concerning the legality of certain proceedings of the executive. He was suspended (1730) for "disrespectful" conduct. He thereupon addressed an appeal to the lords of trade, in which the circumstances of the affair, and the general political conditions prevailing in the province, were recited with great clearness and ability; but the decision of that body was adverse to his cause.

In 1732 he was elected a member of the assembly from the borough of Westchester, and for the next eighteen years was regularly re-elected. He was zealous and prominent in opposing the government on the issue of Van Dam's salary, Chief-Justice Morris's removal, and the course of Zenger's *Journal*. Cosby, referring to him in a letter written to the home authorities, says that "having got himself elected an assemblyman for a borough, he gave all the opposition he could to the measures the house took to make the

government easy." During his father's absence in England (1734-6) he took his place in the popular leadership; and after Cosby's death he was a vigorous antagonist of the succeeding lieutenant-governor, Clarke, in whose official correspondence he is denounced with extreme bitterness. Among other characterizations, Clarke describes him as one of those who have "wrought the people to a pitch of rebellion, who declaim against the king's prerogative, who poison the minds of the people, who libel the governor and all in authority in weekly printed papers, and who have endeavored to distress the governor in his just administration." Continuing, he suggests as a remedy the sending of the younger Morris and others to England for sedition, a step which he regrets he cannot venture upon "without sufficient proof of their crimes to be transmitted with them." Morris's entire course in the assembly was highly acceptable, however, to his constituents and the progressive element of that body. He was chosen to the office of speaker in 1737.

The principal official position occupied by him was that of judge of the high court of admiralty, which in those times had jurisdiction over New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. He was also judge of the court of oyer and terminer.

The younger Lewis Morris was the sole heir to the Manor of Morrisania, of which he was the second "lord." He died there on the 3d of July, 1762.

Married, 1st, March 17, 1723, Tryntje (Catherine) Staats, daughter of Dr. Samuel Staats. She was born in New York City, April 4, 1697; died March 11, 1731.

Issue:

1. Mary Morris, b. November 1, 1724. M., May 9, 1743, Thomas Lawrence, Jr., of Philadelphia.
2. *Lewis Morris* (the Signer); of whom below.
3. Staats Long Morris, b. at Morrisania, August 27, 1728, d. 1800. He was educated at Yale, and at an early age entered the British army, becoming captain of the Thirty-sixth Foot in 1756

and major in 1758. He m., 1st, Lady Catherine, Dowager Dutchess of Gordon (who was the daughter of William, second Earl of Aberdeen, and widow of Cosmo, third Duke of Gordon). By the influence of the connections thus formed he enjoyed rapid advancement. Recruiting a regiment of Highlanders, he was appointed its lieutenant-colonel, and in 1760 sailed for service in the war in India. He was successively appointed brigadiér-general in 1763, major-general in 1777, and general in 1796. During the Revolution his scruples were respected by the government, and he was not sent to serve against his countrymen. He received the sinecure appointment of governor of Quebec in 1797. M., 2d, Jane Urquhart.

4. *Richard Morris*; of whom below.

Married, 2d, November 3, 1746, Sarah Gouverneur, daughter of Nicholas Gouverneur and niece of his first wife.

Issue:

5. Isabella (baptized Josabella) Morris, b. February 3, 1748, d. October 31, 1830. M. Rev. Isaac Wilkins of Castle Hill Neck, in the borough of Westchester. He was a clergyman of the Church of England, and in the events preceding the Revolution was a pronounced tory, being the author of the celebrated "A. W. Farmer" tracts. In 1775 he fled to England, and after the war was a loyalist refugee in Nova Scotia, but in 1798 returned to Westchester County, where he became rector of St. Peter's Church.

6. Sarah Morris, b. November 23, 1749. M. V. P. Ashfield.

7. *Gouverneur Morris*; of whom below.

8. Euphemia Morris, b. September 30, 1754. M. Samuel Ogden.

9. Catherine Morris, b. January 30, 1757, d. December 1, 1776.

IV.

In this generation occurred the branching of the family into various lines of descent. Three of the four sons of the preceding Lewis Morris became heads of families, with male continuance.

LEWIS MORRIS, "the Signer," eldest son of Lewis and Catherine (Staats) Morris, was born at Morrisania, April 8, 1726. He was graduated from Yale College in 1746. Although well qualified for the same prominent part in public affairs which was borne by his father and grandfather, he preferred the pursuits of private life, devoting his attention



MARY WALTON MORRIS,
Wife of Lewis Morris, the Signer.



to the care of the Morrisania estate; and it was not until 1775, when nearly fifty, that his political career began. Previously to that time his public service was confined to a single term in the New York assembly and connection with the militia, in which he had attained the rank of colonel.

Entirely agreeing with the most radical men of the times in opposing the oppressive measures of the British government, he was induced by the course of events to assume the leadership of the patriotic party in Westchester County. In August, 1774, responsive to a circular sent to the rural counties by the "committee of correspondence" in New York City, a convention of the people of Westchester County was held at White Plains to consider the proposal for the election of delegates to a general congress of the colonies at Philadelphia. At this White Plains convention Colonel Morris headed the delegation from the town of Westchester.

Early in 1775, it being apparent that affairs were approaching a crisis, political organization throughout the province of New York became very active. It was decided to hold a provincial convention to appoint delegates to a second general (or "continental") congress. At that period no "committee" or other formal organization had yet been established in Westchester County; and Colonel Morris, as the head of one of the conspicuous families, and a man of recognized force and capacity, was looked to as the natural leader in whatever measures should be taken. In March, by his request, some of the principal men of the county came together in a preliminary caucus, and issued a call for a general meeting of the freeholders or qualified voters, to be held at White Plains on the 11th of April.

The resulting meeting is celebrated in the annals of the times. The situation in Westchester County, dominated by a few aristocratic families, was extremely uncertain, and the outcome of the proposed test of popular sentiment was looked forward to with much anxiety. Strenuous efforts

were made by the great conservative families—the Philippses, De Lanceys, and Pells—to rally a force of adherents sufficient to vote down the aggressive programme planned. But the organization effected by Colonel Morris was so thorough that on the appointed day the conservatives found themselves in a hopeless minority, and did not offer to contest the proposed policy by a vote. A delegation, with Colonel Morris at its head, was duly elected to the coming provincial convention, and emphatic resolutions were adopted.

At the New York provincial convention, held in New York City on the 20th of April, Colonel Morris was one of the leading members, and was chosen a representative from the province to the second continental congress. This historic body assembled at Philadelphia, May 10, 1775, and immediately occupied itself with preparations for war. In the proceedings taken Colonel Morris bore a prominent part, serving on a committee, of which General Washington was chairman, to devise ways and means for supplying the colonies with ammunition and military stores. After the adjournment he was sent on a confidential mission to the west, and for some months was engaged, at Pittsburgh and elsewhere, in negotiation with the Indians, having in view the promotion of alliances with them for the coming struggle.

Returning to the continental congress upon the resumption of its sessions in 1776, he was a member of several of its principal committees, and was concerned in all its great transactions. At the same time he gave his influence toward the strengthening of radical feeling and the discouragement of all compromising courses in New York. He was prominent in securing the adoption of the measures strictly prohibiting intercourse with the English war vessels in the harbor, to which Governor Tryon had fled (April, 1776).

As is well known to all students of the revolutionary history of New York, the proceedings of the continental con-

gress at Philadelphia looking to independence did not have the hearty concurrence of the provincial congress of that colony. The latter body was controlled by able and patriotic but conservative statesmen, who still cherished some hope of reconciliation with Great Britain, and favored judicious delay. Sensible of this prevailing sentiment at home, several of the New York delegates in the continental congress joined in a letter to the provincial congress, early in June, requesting definite instructions as to the course to be pursued on the independence question. The reply was couched in very cautious terms, practically advising against any action on that issue; and the advice thus sent was in no way reversed or modified by the New York congress up to the signing of the Declaration of Independence. It is thus apparent that had the united New York delegation at Philadelphia been guided by the plain directions from home, there would have been no New York name signed to the immortal instrument.

But at the time the letter asking for instructions was dispatched, Lewis Morris declined to become a party to it. Concerning the question of ultimately supporting independence, as elsewhere remarked by the present writer, there is "no room for doubt that he was inflexibly resolved upon that line of conduct from the first, and entirely without reference to instructions from home," and "deemed himself fully qualified, as a duly chosen representative from New York, to act upon the measure according to his individual judgment."¹⁶ It is related that at the time the Declaration was presented to him for signature he had just finished reading a letter from his brother in England, General Staats Long Morris, in which he was strongly urged not to take rash steps, but to think of the consequences; whereupon he exclaimed, "Damm the consequences! Give me the pen."

¹⁶"History of Westchester County," by Frederic Shonnard and W. W. Spooner, p. 333.

Three of his New York colleagues also signed—William Floyd, Philip Livingston, and Francis Lewis.

On that historic day, July 4, 1776, a great British fleet, bearing an army of some thirty-three thousand English and mercenary soldiers sent for the subjugation of America, was riding in New York Bay. Every one knew that the immediate business of this formidable host was the taking of New York City and occupation of the surrounding country. Of all the men who sat in congress at Philadelphia, none had graver personal issues at stake than Lewis Morris, whose magnificent estate at Morrisania lay just beyond the confines of the city, and would surely be seized at an early day as the property of a conspicuous revolutionary partisan. Upon his patriotic mind, however, this circumstance did not at any time exercise the smallest influence.

While absent in Philadelphia, in June, Colonel Morris was appointed by the New York provincial congress brigadier-general of the Westchester County militia. He was a member of the first New York state convention, which assembled at White Plains on the 9th of July and took measures for the organization of the state government. Throughout Washington's Westchester County campaign, and at the battle of White Plains (October 28, 1776), he was in active service in his command, also taking an important part in the succeeding winter campaign in New Jersey, and being present at the battles of Trenton and Princeton. He and his three eldest sons were at the same time in the American army, and their letters to Mrs. Morris have been printed in the records of the New York Historical Society.

At the expiration of the term for which he was elected, he retired from the continental congress, his place being taken by his younger brother, Gouverneur. From this time General Morris was not especially active, either in legislative or military affairs, although continuing to exert his influence in the cause. He was the first judge of Westchester County under the state government, being appointed May

8, 1777, and serving until February 17, 1778; and was also elected as one of the first two state senators from Westchester County (1777), his colleague being General Pierre Van Cortlandt. With the occupation of New York City and the lower part of Westchester County by the British—which continued throughout the Revolution,—he and his family were forced to flee from Morrisania, taking refuge on lands which he owned in New Jersey. The entire Morrisania property was devastated by the enemy, the mansion pillaged, the stock appropriated and driven off, and more than a thousand acres of woodland burned. Even the mortuary remains of the Morrises were not spared, the family vault being opened, the coffins broken, and the bones scattered.

After the war he returned, and by degrees restored the estate to an orderly condition. Though still preferring the quiet of private life, the closing part of his career was marked by additional public honors. He was elected to the New York assembly and promoted to the rank of major-general of militia. In 1788 he was a member of the convention at Poughkeepsie which ratified the United States constitution. He died at Morrisania, January 22, 1798.

Married, September 24, 1749, Mary Walton, daughter of Jacob and Maria (Beekman) Walton, of New York City.

[The Waltons were among the most noteworthy and affluent families of New York, their wealth being cited in parliament to show the prosperity of the province. The American ancestor, William Walton, early in the eighteenth century, established extensive shipyards along the East River, built numerous vessels—the finest and fastest of their times,—and was engaged in a flourishing trade, especially with the West Indies. In 1754 he built the celebrated Walton mansion, in Pearl Street opposite the present establishment of Harper and Brothers. The Waltons were also the largest New York underwriters of the eighteenth century. Jacob Walton, father of Mary Walton (who m. Lewis Morris the Signer) was the eldest son of William Walton, and continued the firm's business.¹⁷]

¹⁷For many particulars regarding the Walton Family, see the "Memorial History of the City of New York," vols. ii., p. 305; iv., p. 523, and index.

Issue:

Lewis Morris; of whom below.

General Jacob Morris; of whom below.

William Walton Morris; of whom below.

James Morris; of whom below.

Staats Morris. M., 1800, Catalina Van Braeme. Issue: Frederick Morris, Walter Morris, Lewis Nelson Morris,¹⁸ Sarah Morris (m. Dr. Leonard), Louisa Morris (m. Norman Squires).

Richard Valentine Morris; of whom below.

Mary Morris, d. 1776. M., July, 1775, Thomas Lawrence.

Catherine Morris, d. November 23, 1834. M., August 2, 1778, Thomas Lawrence.

Sarah Morris.

Helena Morris, b. 1762, d. October 6, 1840. M., October 30, 1782, John Rutherford, afterward United States senator from New Jersey.

To be continued.

¹⁸He was born in Albany, N. Y., 1800, was graduated from the United States Military Academy, and after twenty years of frontier service was assigned to duty in the Mexican War. At the battle of Monterey (1846) he was killed while leading his regiment against the enemy's work.

IOWANS IN JOHN BROWN'S RAID, AND THE
AUTHOR OF THE MYSTERIOUS "FLOYD
LETTER."

BY THE LATE BENJAMIN F. GUE,

Lieutenant-Governor of Iowa.

ON the 3d of July, 1859, John Brown, his sons Owen and Oliver, and John E. Cook were at Harper's Ferry carefully making observations and plans for the attack. The men enlisted for the enterprise were assembling at the Kennedy farm, a few miles distant on the Maryland side of the Potomac. Here the arms, including a large number of pikes, were secreted. The appearance of a party of strange men at the farm had aroused suspicion in the neighborhood and warrants had been taken out for searching the premises. As soon as Brown was informed of this danger he issued orders for the attack at once, eight days in advance of the time that had been originally fixed, and several men who were on the way failed to reach the rendezvous in time to participate in the desperate conflict.

On the 16th day of October there was assembled at the Kennedy farm a remarkable group of men, twenty-two in number. As the roll was called on that eventful morning, the following persons responded "Here": John Brown, Owen Brown, Watson Brown, Oliver Brown, A. D. Stevens, John E. Cook, J. H. Kagi, Charles P. Tidd, Edwin Coppoc, Barclay Coppoc, J. G. Anderson, Steward Taylor, Albert Hazlett, Francis J. Merriam, William Thompson, Dauphin A. Thompson, William H. Leeman, Oliver P. Anderson, John A. Copeland, Lewis S. Leary, Dangerfield

Newby, and John Anderson. The last five were colored men. Brown now issued his written orders, eleven in number, assigning to each man his part in the attack. Thirteen of the band had proved their valor on the battlefields of Kansas.

Iowa furnished more actors in the great tragedy of the death of John Brown and most of his youthful followers than any other state. It was in Iowa that he established his chain of stations on the "Underground Railroad," leading from the Missouri slave plantations to freedom. It was at Springdale that his men had been drilled for the desperate assault upon slavery. Of the twenty-six volunteers who enlisted in this "forlorn hope," Edwin Coppoc, Barclay Coppoc, Steward Taylor, Jeremiah G. Anderson, George B. Gill, and Charles W. Moffat were Iowa men. It was in Iowa that the rifles and revolvers were collected and secreted for arming the volunteers who were expected to join the expedition at Harper's Ferry. It was from West Liberty, Ia., that they were shipped as "carpenters' tools," by John H. Painter, to a fictitious consignee near Harper's Ferry. It was from Iowa that the mysterious letter of warning was written to the secretary of war two months before the attack. It was an Iowa governor who saved from the Virginia gallows the Iowa boy who escaped death and capture in the bloody conflict.

When the true story of the tragic affair came it was learned that twenty men captured Harper's Ferry and seventeen of them held it for two days and three nights against Virginia citizens and militia, from one to two thousand strong. One by one the members of the heroic little band fell. Not a man flinched. When the third night came, John Brown, Edwin Coppoc, Shields Green, Jeremiah G. Anderson, Watson Brown, and Dauphin A. Thompson were the only survivors cooped in the engine-house. Ten had been killed and several more severely wounded; still Brown sternly refused to surrender. It required a re-enforcement

of one hundred United States marines, commanded by Robert E. Lee, and an assault led by J. E. B. Stuart, to enable the army to capture or slay the six unyielding emancipators. Of the Iowa members of the little army, Steward Taylor was killed at the engine-house; Jeremiah G. Anderson was pierced through by bayonets in the last assault; Edwin Coppoc, who fought to the end, was disarmed and captured unhurt.

Owen Brown, Barclay Coppoc, and F. J. Merriam had been left on the Maryland side to guard the arms there stored, while John E. Cook and C. P. Tidd were sent over Tuesday morning to take some prisoners to the schoolhouse. More than a thousand armed men were now between them and the spot where their leader and six survivors were making the last desperate fight. To join them was impossible. Lieutenant Hazlett, with O. P. Anderson and Shields Green, had been detailed to hold the arsenal, which they did until cut off from their comrades by a great body of militia. Brown and the other survivors, now surrounded, had retreated to the engine-house for shelter. Green, who went as a substitute for Frederick Douglass, was a very black negro slave, having escaped from South Carolina, where he left his only boy in slavery. He fought like a tiger all through. Now, when Anderson and Hazlett saw that everything was lost, and there was a bare possibility to escape, they urged Green to go with them. He turned and looked toward Brown and the remnant of his command fighting at the door of the engine-house, and pointing toward them, said: "You think dere's no chance?"

"Not one," said Anderson.

"An' de ole captain can't get away?"

"No," said both men.

"Well," said the loyal negro, "guess I'll go back to de ole man." And he marched calmly to certain death.

Anderson and Hazlett escaped across the river in the gathering darkness, the latter only to be captured and hung.

The men on the Maryland side would not abandon their companions as long as there was a ray of hope. Led by Owen Brown, they approached as near as possible to the ferry and saw more than a thousand armed men between them and their comrades. Rescue was hopeless, but the chivalrous Cook crept still closer, and climbing among the limbs of a huge oak, opened fire on the enemy. Twenty or thirty men in range of his rifle fled to shelter, while a hundred guns were turned upon him. The balls severed the limb upon which he was resting, and he fell to the ground. With a parting shot he turned sadly away and joined his companions in retreat to the mountains.

Volumes have been written in this country and Europe on John Brown the liberator and martyr, who gave his life without a murmur to free the slaves. The noblest men and women of his generation have paid tributes to his unselfish life and his fidelity to duty as he saw it—a fidelity which led him to the scaffold. His name will live in history for all time. But little is known of his twenty-two followers, who, in the early morning of their lives, actuated by the same spirit of self-sacrifice, enlisted in his "forlorn hope" and bravely marched to heroic deeds and almost certain death. In the world's history no more desperate and apparently hopeless undertaking has ever been entered upon by sane men. The chances of success were not one in a thousand, and yet these young men were so imbued with their leader's abhorrence of slavery, a fierce and fearless determination to devote their lives to its destruction, that they stopped not to count the cost or to calmly consider the chances of success. They had such confidence in the wisdom, courage, and invincibility of their leader that where he commanded they marched without a murmur; where he led they hesitated not to follow.

Not one of them could have been actuated by selfish motives. There was no hope of reward, even in case of success. There was no pay for time or services, promised or

expected. There were no honors to be won; there was no glory to be achieved. They fully realized that death was far more likely to meet them than was success. And yet twenty-two men in the fervor of youth freely offered their services and their lives, if need be, to strike a blow at American slavery, which they firmly believed would in some way not clearly developed result in its final overthrow. As unlikely as it appeared to all the world beside, they were not mistaken. They sacrificed their own lives, but the sacrifice proved to be the fire-brand which in less than five years melted with the red glare of a hundred battlefields the shackles from four millions of slaves.

Justice to the memory of the four young men from Iowa who fought at Harper's Ferry in John Brown's band requires a permanent record of what is known of their lives and deaths.

Steward Taylor was born at Uxbridge, Canada, October 29, 1836. He came to Iowa when but seventeen years old and learned the wagonmaker's trade at West Liberty. Here he became acquainted with George B. Gill, who took him to Springdale in the winter of 1858, and at John H. Painter's house they met John Brown. Young Taylor was greatly impressed with the fervor of the old "hero of Osawatomie," and listened eagerly to his recitals of the horrors of American slavery. He made the acquaintance also of the young men who were drilling under Stevens at the Maxson farm for the Harper's Ferry campaign, and soon after enlisted with them. When the Chatham convention was held he went to Canada to attend it. While waiting for the leader to complete his plans for the invasion, Taylor found work at his trade in Illinois. He waited impatiently for many months for notice to join the expedition. At times he feared that he was not to be included in the select band that was to strike the blow, and he wrote to an Iowa friend: "My hopes were crushed and I felt as though I was deprived of my chief object in life. I believe that fate has decreed me for this

undertaking, although at one time I had given up being wanted." But early in July, 1859, a letter came from Kagi telling him to "come on." He wrote back: "It is my chief desire to add fuel to the flame. My ardent passion for the work is my thought by day and my dream by night." He raised what money was due him and at once started for the rendezvous at Chambersburg, Pa., paying his own expenses. He was now twenty-one years of age and is described as of medium height, rather heavy in build, strong, and capable of great endurance. His complexion was dark, his hair reddish-brown, his eyes dark brown, large, and full. He was smooth-faced and boyish looking; a constant student, always carrying books with him; a stenographer, and played the violin. He was quiet but persistent in his purposes, faithful, courageous, and loyal. When John Brown issued his eleven orders, just before the night of the attack, No. 6 required Captain Watson Brown and Steward Taylor to "hold the covered bridge over the Potomac and arrest anyone attempting to cross, using pikes, if resistance is offered, instead of Sharpe's rifles." Taylor was cool and fearless throughout the conflict. He escorted one of Brown's prisoners to his home, to let his family know of his safety, and brought him back through crowds of armed, excited, desperate, drunken men. Later on in the day, while bravely fighting near the engine-house, he received a mortal wound. He fell in the thickest of the fight and suffered great agony for three hours, when death came to his relief. The day before the attack he remarked to his comrades that he felt he would be one of the first killed. He was so impressed with the presentiment that he wrote farewell letters to his friends at home, and then calmly marched to his death. Anne Brown, who kept house for her father, brothers, and their comrades at the Kennedy farm, says of Steward Taylor: "He was one who could never have betrayed a friend or deserted a post."

Jeremiah G. Anderson was the grandson of an officer of

the American Revolution. His father, John Anderson, left the slave state of Virginia soon after his marriage and settled in Putnam County, Ind., where Jeremiah was born on the 17th of April, 1833. After his father's death his mother removed with her family to Des Moines, Ia. Jeremiah was well educated. He was sent by his mother to a Presbyterian academy at Kossuth, in 1854, to prepare for the ministry. Hon. James W. McDill, afterward judge and United States senator, was one of his instructors. Judge McDill said, "he was an eccentric young man, quiet, and very studious." But he had no taste for the orthodox ministry. In an essay he declared his belief in universal salvation, and soon after became a spiritualist. In 1857 Jeremiah went to Kansas and took a claim on the Little Osage. He joined Colonel Montgomery's army and fought with him to make Kansas a free state. Afterward he served under John Brown, was with him in one of his successful incursions for the liberation of Missouri slaves, again joined him in New York while the Harper's Ferry campaign was being organized, and was one of his most trusted and faithful friends. John Brown told Gerrit Smith that "Anderson was more than a friend; he was as a brother and a son." Three days before his execution Captain Brown said: "My brother Jeremiah was fighting bravely by my side at Harper's Ferry up to the moment when I was struck down." When Colonel Lee's marines broke through the barricade and charged on its five defenders, Anderson was pierced with three bayonets as his smoking rifle fell from his grasp. Mortally wounded, he was dragged out by his captors, thrown down on the stone flagging, and left to the mercy of the brutal crowd. He lingered there in great agony for three hours, subjected to the most fiendish tortures. When death finally ended his sufferings, two village doctors came and crowded his mutilated body into a salt barrel, stamping it down with their feet. That was the last seen of Jeremiah G. Anderson, the close

friend of John Brown and one of the bravest Iowa soldiers who ever marched to death.

Edwin Coppoc was born near Salem, O., June 30, 1835. His father died when he was a child, and he lived many years with his grandfather, going to district school and working on a farm. He is described as a studious, industrious boy of cheerful disposition. His eyes and hair were brown and his skin fair, his head large and well formed; he was fond of athletic sports, and a genial companion. As a young man he was intelligent, active, brave, loyal, and the soul of honor. He had winning manners, was amiable, generous, and kind. Anne Brown says of Edwin: "He was a rare young fellow, fearing nothing, yet possessed of great social traits, and no better comrade have I ever met." His mother was a woman of unusual intelligence and force of character, who strongly opposed the determination of her sons to enlist in the desperate enterprise. She had married again and her sons were living with her at Springdale when John Brown and his men came there to prepare for the Virginia invasion. Her boys eagerly listened to the story of the wrongs and cruelties inflicted upon the helpless slaves, as eloquently told by John Brown, and longed to help them to freedom. Edwin and his younger brother, Barclay, at last determined to join the young men who were drilling at the Maxson farm and to follow wherever the old liberator should strike the next blow for emancipation. On the 15th of July a letter came from John Brown requesting them to come on to Chambersburg, Pa. On the 25th they bade their mother goodby and started ostensibly for Ohio. But their mother was not deceived; she knew too well their destination and expected never to see them again. Order No. 9, made out by Captain Brown the day of the attack, details "Lieutenant Albert Hazlett and Edwin Coppoc to hold the armory opposite the engine-house after it is taken, remaining there until morning, when further orders will be given." The fight began early in the forenoon and Brown was so

hotly engaged that his usual good judgment failed him and he did not realize the great peril until his little band was hemmed in on all sides by overwhelming numbers and retreat to the mountains was impossible. His detachments, widely separated, stood at their posts with a courage never surpassed in the annals of warfare. One by one they fell before the volleys pouring in upon them from every side. We hear of Edwin Coppoc standing at his post at the armory gates, while balls rained around him like hailstones. Soon after he joined Brown at the engine-house and the siege began. Watson and Oliver, sons of the leader, were mortally wounded, but the heroic Watson fought on to the last. John Brown, his son Watson, Jerry Anderson, Edwin Coppoc, Dauphin A. Thompson, Steward Taylor, and Shields Green were now the only survivors left on the Virginia side. Escape was impossible, and they determined to die fighting, knowing that no mercy would be shown them as prisoners. Colonel Robert E. Lee, who was now in command of their assailants, sent a message to Brown demanding his surrender.

"No!" said Brown, "we prefer to die here."

Firing began again on both sides, while Lee formed a column for assault.

Few know how near the future Southern Confederacy came to losing its greatest military leader at this moment at the hands of an Iowa boy. Edwin Coppoc saw from his port-hole the blue uniform of the commander, and instantly drew a deadly bead on Lee at close range. Jesse W. Graham, one of Brown's prisoners, who was watching Coppoc, knew Lee and saw his danger. Instantly springing forward he caught the rifle before Coppoc could fire, and during the struggle Lee stepped out of range.

When the shock of the final charge came, Brown, Anderson, and Thompson went down beneath the thrusts of sabers and bayonets. Edwin Coppoc fired the last shot, and he and Green alone were left unhurt to surrender. The fight

was ended. Ten of the little band were slain. Brown and Stevens were desprately wounded, and with Coppoc, Green, and Copeland were prisoners. William Thompson and W. H. Leeman, who had before surrendered, were butchered in cold blood. Harper's Ferry had been held fifty-eight hours by seventeen men against the assaults of from five hundred to fifteen hundred armed citizens and militia from Maryland and Virginia.¹

On the 22d of November Edwin Coppoc wrote home an account of the battle, in which he said:

"Eleven of our little band are now sleeping in their bloody garments with the cold earth above them. Braver men never lived; truer men to their plighted word never banded together. . . . As our comrades fell we could not minister to their wants as they deserved, for we were surrounded by troops firing volley after volley, and we had to keep up a brisk fire in return to keep them from charging upon us. Watson Brown was wounded on Monday, at the same time Stevens was, while carrying a flag of truce; but he got back to the engine-house. He fought as bravely as any man. When the fight was over he got worse. He and Green and myself were put in the watch-house. Watson kept getting worse until Wednesday morning, and begged hard for a bed, but could not get one. I pulled off my coat and put it under him and placed his head in my lap, and in that position he died. Whatever may be our fate, rest assured we shall not shame our dead companions by a shrinking fear. They lived and died like brave men; we, I trust, shall do the same."

On the 19th Edwin Coppoc, Green, and Copeland were taken to Charlestown jail, which was guarded by state militia with two cannon trained on it. Edwin's trial began on the afternoon of November 1, and ended the following day with conviction. He was sentenced to be hung on the 16th of December. He bore himself bravely through the ordeal and calmly awaited his doom. He and Cook were confined in the same cell and were very warm friends. Great sympathy was felt for Edwin Coppoc, and it was not confined to his Ohio and Iowa friends. Even Governor Wise could

¹Hinton gives the loss of life as follows: Of Brown's band, ten were killed and seven more executed; of the liberated slaves, seventeen were slain; of the citizens and soldiers, eight were killed and nine wounded. Total killed, forty-two.

not refrain from expressing his admiration for his noble bearing through all the trying scenes of the battle, surrender, trial, and conviction. He asked no favors, made no complaints, but calmly accepted the consequences of his effort to free the slaves. He faced his awful doom without a murmur. His grandfather and uncle from Salem, O., and Thomas Gwynn of Cedar County, Ia., went to Virginia to appeal to Governor Wise for a commutation of his sentence to imprisonment, and to his credit let it be known that the governor made such a recommendation to the legislature, as, in cases of treason, he had not the power to interfere. A committee of that body recommended the commutation, but the Virginia legislature demanded his death. Shields Green, the faithful negro, managed to secrete an old knife when captured, which he now gave to Coppoc. Edwin contrived to notch the blade into a rude saw. With this he and Cook sawed the shackles from their limbs and digging a hole through the brick wall of their cell the night before execution, made a bold strike for freedom. But the guards discovered them as they crept out and they were returned to their cells. The few remaining hours of their lives were spent in writing farewell letters to their friends. The morning of their last day dawned upon Cook and Coppoc. They were as calm and brave in death as they had been through the two days of fierce battle. Their comrades, Green and Copeland, were executed at 10.30 A. M., December 16, and at half-past twelve Cook and Coppoc were taken from their cells. They were permitted to bid Hazlett and Stevens goodbye on their way to the scaffold. When the black caps were drawn over their heads they clasped each other's hands in a last farewell and calmly met their doom. Edwin's body was taken by his friends to his boyhood home at Salem and there laid to rest among his kindred.

Barclay Coppoc, Edwin's younger brother, was born January 4, 1839. He was somewhat taller than Edwin, of slender build, brown hair, bold, large eyes, and a determined ex-

pression. He was threatened with consumption from boyhood. When nineteen years of age he joined a party going to Kansas. Emigrant life improved his health and he enjoyed the stirring events of the Free State conflict with the Missouri invaders. Here he met Aaron D. Stevens, Richard Realf, and John Brown, and enlisted in a number of their expeditions. When his old leader came to Springdale, a year later, Barclay was ready to again take up arms against slavery. As we have seen, he was not in the desperate fight at Harper's Ferry, from the fact that he was sent with Owen Brown's party to guard their arms on the Maryland side. After all was lost and they escaped to the mountains, Owen Brown was by common consent made their leader. A large reward was offered by Governor Wise for their arrest and delivery to the jail of Jefferson County. The country was soon alive with armed men hunting for the fugitives. Governor Wise described Barclay Coppoc as follows:

"He is about twenty years of age; is about five feet seven and a half inches in height, with hazel eyes and brown hair, wears a light mustache, and has a consumptive look."

Each member of the party was as minutely described. Cook was so well known at Harper's Ferry that a perfect description was given of him and a reward of \$1,000 was offered for his capture. As the men passed near Chambersburg, in the mountains, Cook could not resist the temptation to venture into that town in the darkness of night to see his young wife and say goodbye before going on to Canada. His companions protested most earnestly, but he started on, after appointing a place to meet them before morning. They waited at the meeting-place long and anxiously, but never saw him again.

The story of the fearful sufferings of these men as they wandered for thirty-six days through the wilds of the Maryland and Pennsylvania mountains would fill a volume. Subsisting on unground field corn, occasional fruit, raw chicken now and then, without shelter or fire, huddling together

when sleeping amid chilling rains, sleet, and snow, with feet lacerated by sharp rocks and thorns, always nearly perishing from hunger, human suffering reached its limit. They were pursued by human and brute bloodhounds—the first eager for blood money and the latter thirsting for their life-blood. Merriam soon gave out. He was left on a railroad track, entered an obscure station, and, at a great risk, took a train and escaped.

After reaching northern Pennsylvania, starving and utterly exhausted, the others at last ventured to seek shelter at a farmhouse. Weeks had elapsed since they had escaped, and not a word had reached them of the fate of their comrades. A paper was lying on the table. Tidd took it up and began to read. His face paled as he read on. Owen and Barclay were watching him intently. With a forced calmness Tidd then began to read aloud the story of the trial and death sentence of John Brown and Edwin Coppoc and the capture of Cook and Hazlett. Tears rolled down Barclay's cheeks as the fate of his brother, the old captain, and the gallant Cook was read; but not a word dared they utter. After leaving them, it seems that Cook had suddenly come to a clearing in the woods before dark, and found himself face to face with three woodchoppers. Two of them were stalwart brothers named Logan, professional slave-catchers. They had seen the description of Cook and knew of the \$1,000 reward. They recognized and seized him at once, and binding his arms, delivered him over to the Virginia officers and obtained the reward. One of the Logans joined the rebel army two years later and was killed by a union bullet. The other lived many years, always suffering remorse for the infamous sale of the gallant Cook. He was finally crushed to death beneath the wheels of a railroad train.

The three famished men traveled on, after a night's rest for the first time in a month under a roof, and in a few days more felt reasonably safe to travel by daylight. Coppoc soon after took a train for Iowa, which he safely reached,

worn almost to a skeleton by starvation and exposure. He appeared suddenly in his old home on the 17th of December and met a warm and tearful welcome. His brother Edwin and his comrade Cook had died on a Virginia scaffold the day before. Barclay was so near death from his terrible sufferings that his Springdale friends determined to defend him in his own home from surrender to the hangman. Armed and drilled, the guard kept nightly watch over him for many weeks. F. C. Galbraith, of Springdale, thus describes the plans of his defenders:

"Springdale is in arms, and is prepared to a half-hour's notice to give his pursuers a reception of two hundred shots. There are three of our number who always know his whereabouts, and nobody else knows anything of him. He is never seen at night where he was during the day, and there are men on watch at Davenport, Muscatine, Iowa City, West Liberty, and Tipton. It is intended to baffle them in every possible way without bloodshed."

On the 23d day of January, 1860, Governor Kirkwood was called upon by a Mr. Camp, sent by Governor Letcher of Virginia, bearing a requisition for the arrest and surrender of Barclay Coppoc. Two members of the legislature² who entered the executive office while the interview was in progress give the following report of what occurred:

"We found in conference with the governor a pompous-looking man, who seemed to be greatly excited. Governor Kirkwood was calmly listening to the violent language of this individual, who was swinging his arms wildly in his wrath. The governor quietly suggested to the stranger that 'he had supposed he did not want his business made public.' The rude reply was, 'I don't care a d—n who knows it now, since you have refused to honor the requisition.' The pompous man then proceeded to argue the case with the governor, and we soon learned that he was an agent from Virginia bearing a requisition from Governor Letcher³ for the surrender of Barclay Coppoc. In reply to a remark by the agent that Coppoc might escape before he could get the defect in the requisition cured, the governor, looking significantly at us, replied: 'There is a law under which you can arrest Coppoc and hold him until the requisition is granted,' and the governor reached for the code. We waited to hear no more, but, saying to the governor that we would call again when he was not engaged, and giving him a look that was a response to his own, we walked out."

²The two members were Ed Wright and B. F. Gue of Scott.

³Governor Wise's term expired January 1, 1860, and he was succeeded by Governor Letcher.

We felt there was not a moment to lose if we would save Coppoc from the Virginia gallows, and hastily communicated with J. W. Cattell, J. B. Grinnell, David Hunt, Amos Hoag, and other well known anti-slavery members of the legislature. It was instantly decided that a special messenger must be sent to warn Coppoc and his friends of the danger. A purse was hastily made up, and Isaac Brandt was delegated to find a man of nerve, who could endure a horseback ride in midwinter of a hundred and sixty-five miles without sleep or rest. He soon produced a small, wiry young man who was an experienced horseman and as tireless as a cowboy. His name was Williams. A fast horse was procured, while Williams equipped himself for a ride for life. Credentials were hastily prepared, to be presented by our messenger to the agents of the "Underground Railroad" on the route, to enable him to procure fresh horses at each point without delay. A note was written to a trusted friend at Springdale, of which the following is a copy:

"Des Moines, January 23, 1860.

"John H. Painter: There is an application for young Coppoc from the governor of Virginia, and the governor here will be compelled to surrender him. If he is in your neighborhood tell him to make his escape from the United States.

"Your Friend."

It was not prudent to sign a name to the note, but it bore its stamp of genuineness in the well-known hand-writing of Senator Cattell, with which Painter was familiar. In less than two hours from the time we left the executive rooms, the sharp, rapid strokes of the shoes of a fast horse on the frozen ground resounded on the old stage-road out by the "Prairie Queen" and on to Four Mile Ridge. The rider was enveloped in a huge buffalo overcoat and fur cap, while a small leather saddle valise carried his baggage and refreshments to fortify against a piercing east wind, which he faced. His instructions were to reach Springdale as soon as horse-flesh and human endurance could make it and then rest, sleep, and return at his leisure.

We confidently expected that Mr. Camp, the Virginian, would take the first stage east, which traveled day and night with frequent change of horses, and arrest Coppoc before his friends could be rallied. We knew there was a drilled band of seventy-five determined young men in and about Springdale who were well armed and had declared that Barclay Coppoc should never be surrendered to the Virginia governor who had a few weeks before hung John Brown, Edwin Coppoc, John E. Cook, Shields Green, and John Copeland. If our messenger could reach Springdale before Mr. Camp could get to Iowa City and procure a posse to make the arrest, a bloody conflict would be prevented and Coppoc would be able to reach a place of safety. On the morning of the 25th, Mr. Williams alighted from his last foaming horse at John H. Painter's, and Barclay Coppoc was saved.

When Mr. Camp reached Iowa City, he heard of the armed guard of Coppoc's friends at Springdale, and remembering that John Brown, with seventeen young men of the same stamp, had held Harper's Ferry two days and three nights against a thousand armed Virginians, he had no consuming desire to lead an officer's squad against the Sharpe's rifles of Coppoc's defenders. He journeyed on to Muscatine to await legal requisition papers.

The day after our messenger started, it became known that Governor Kirkwood's legal learning had enabled him to detect flaws in Governor Letcher's requisition papers and that he had refused to surrender Coppoc. M. V. Bennett (a bitter democratic partisan member of the lower house of the legislature from Marion County), presented resolutions of inquiry, sometime after the affair became public, as follows:

"Whereas, A requisition was made on the governor of Iowa by the governor of Virginia for Barclay Coppoc, an alleged participant in the difficulties at Harper's Ferry, Va., as a fugitive from justice; and

"Whereas, The governor of Iowa has refused to deliver up said Coppoc under said requisition, alleging technical defects therein; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the governor of Iowa be requested to lay before the

house a copy of the requisition directed to him by the governor of Virginia, and all matters connected therewith; also to inform this house whether he possessed any knowledge in regard to a rumor that a special messenger was dispatched to inform Coppoc of his danger; and if so, by what authority said messenger was dispatched to inform Coppoc of his danger."

On motion of W. H. F. Gurley of Scott County, the resolutions were somewhat changed and passed. In response to them Governor Kirkwood sent all the papers in the case to the house with a special message. The reasons which he gave for refusing to order Coppoc's arrest were: First, no indictment had been found against him; Second, the affidavit was made before an alleged notary public, but was not authenticated by a notary's seal; Third, the affidavit did not show that Coppoc was in Virginia aiding and abetting John Brown; Fourth, it did not legally charge him with commission of any crime. The governor said:

"It is a high prerogative of official power in any case to seize a citizen of the state and send him upon an ex-parte statement without any preliminary examination, and without confronting him with a single witness, to a distant state for trial. It is a prerogative so high that the law tolerates its exercise only on certain fixed conditions, and I shall not exercise that power to the peril of any citizen of Iowa upon demand of the state of Virginia, or any other state, unless these conditions are complied with.

"The fact that an agent of Virginia was here with a requisition for Coppoc became publicly known solely through the acts of the agent himself. After I had communicated my determination to him not to grant the warrant, he sat in my office conversing with me on the subject. During our conversation other persons came in, and to my surprise he continued the conversation in their presence. I said to him that 'I supposed he did not wish his business made known to the public.' He replied that as the warrant had been refused he did not care who knew it. In this manner the fact that a requisition had been made for Coppoc became known in this place. The insinuation that I had anything to do, directly or indirectly, with sending information to Coppoc that a requisition had been sent for him, is simply and unqualifiedly untrue; nor have I any means of knowing whether such information was sent by others, or, if so, by whom sent, other than common rumor. Permit me to say in conclusion that one of the most important duties of the official position I hold is to see that no citizen of Iowa is carried beyond her border and subjected to the ignominy of imprisonment and the perils of trial for crimes in another state otherwise than by due process of law. That duty I shall perform."

These ringing words of the fearless old war governor stand out in bold contrast to the cringing attitude of Governor Packer of Pennsylvania, who hastened to send two of Coppoc's companions (Cook and Hazlett) back to the Virginia gallows without even an investigation of the legality of the papers.

Governor Letcher was in a great rage when the Iowa governor's refusal reached him, but he understood that nothing short of a rigid compliance with all requirements of law would enable him to wrest a victim for execution from Iowa. He had the grand jury summoned and procured Coppoc's indictment. The following is one of the counts in the famous document:

"Thirteenth Judicial Circuit of Virginia, Jefferson County.

"The jurors of the commonwealth of Virginia, in and for the body of the county of Jefferson, duly empanelled and attending upon said court, upon their oaths present that Barclay Coppoc being a free person, on the sixteenth and seventeenth days of October, in the year 1859, and on divers other days before and after that time, in the county of Jefferson and commonwealth of Virginia aforesaid, and within the jurisdiction of this court, not having the fear of God before his eyes, but being moved and seduced by the instigation of the devil, did maliciously, wilfully, and feloniously conspire with certain John Brown, Edwin Coppoc, John E. Cook, Shields Green, John Copeland, Aaron D. Stevens, and other persons to the jurors unknown, to induce certain slaves of said county and commonwealth aforesaid, to wit, slaves called Henry, Levi, Ben, Jerry, Phil, George, and Bill, the slaves of John H. Allstadt, and each of said slaves respectively, to rebel and make insurrection against their said masters, and against the authority of the constitution and laws of the commonwealth of Virginia, to the evil example of all others in like case offending, and against the peace and dignity of the commonwealth of Virginia.

"Endorsed, 'A True Bill,' February 3, 1860.

"J. A. LEWIS, Foreman."⁴

It was the 10th day of February before Governor Letcher's legal requisition reached Des Moines. Then Governor Kirkwood was compelled to issue his warrant for the arrest, but Coppoc was not to be found. His friends promptly received news of the last requisition. That night, with his

⁴The original papers in this case, with a copy of Virginia's indictment of Barclay Coppoc, may be seen in the Historical Department of Iowa.

staunch friend, Thaddeus Maxson, Barclay was conveyed in a sleigh to Mechanicsville, accompanied by a well-armed guard. Coppoc and Maxson took the night train on the Northwestern Road for Chicago, where they staid several days with a trusted family of colored friends. They went on to Canada and remained until the Virginia officer left for his home. Learning that his late companions, Owen Brown and F. J. Merriam, were staying in Ashtabula County, O., Barclay and his friend Maxson joined them, and the little party staid several weeks at the town of Dorset. They were always well armed and ready to defend themselves day or night.

The young man who so narrowly escaped death the second time was not to be intimidated by dangers. Barclay Coppoc never ceased his war upon slavery. Early in the summer of 1860 he went to Kansas and aided some Missouri slaves to freedom. When the Civil War began he hastened to join the union army and was commissioned lieutenant in the Fourth Kansas Volunteers, commanded by the gallant Colonel Montgomery of Kansas War fame. Lieutenant Coppoc was sent to his old home in Iowa to secure recruits. On his return with them he met his death on the 30th of August, 1861, from the burning of a railroad bridge by the Missouri guerillas, precipitating the train he was on eighty feet into the Platte River. A large number were killed and wounded. Lieutenant Coppoc's body was taken to Leavenworth and buried in Pilot Knob Cemetery. On a soldier's monument erected at Tipton, near his old home, by the patriotic people of Cedar County, to the memory of its citizen soldiers who gave their lives for their country in the Rebellion, is inscribed the name of Barclay Coppoc.

The Maxson house near Springdale is still standing. Carefully preserved on the wall are the names of John Brown's men who spent the winter of 1858 there drilling for the Harper's Ferry campaign. A few days before they left in the spring each one placed his signature in pencil on the wall of

the room used by them. They were Owen Brown, John E. Cook, Aaron D. Stevens, John H. Kagi, Richard Realf, Charles P. Tidd, William H. Leeman, Charles W. Moffat, Luke F. Parsons, Richard Richardson, and George B. Gill. Parsons, Realf, Moffat, Richardson, and Gill failed to report at the Kennedy farm before the attack and were not in the battle.

On the 14th of December, 1859, the senate of the United States appointed a committee to investigate and report all facts obtainable bearing upon the affair, and especially to inquire whether such invasion was made under color of any organization intended to subvert the government of any of the states of the union, and whether any citizens not present were implicated therein. The committee consisted of Senators James M. Mason of Virginia, Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, G. M. Fitch of Indiana, Jacob Collamer of Vermont, and J. R. Doolittle of Wisconsin. The committee had power to send for persons and papers. Its investigations were of the most rigid character, as a majority of its members sought to implicate prominent republicans and abolitionists of the northern states as instigators. Among the witnesses called before that committee were such eminent republicans as John A. Andrew, William H. Seward, Joshua R. Giddings, Henry Wilson, and Charles Robinson. All efforts to connect leading citizens of the north with John Brown's invasion failed after more than five months of persistent efforts by Mason, Davis, and Fitch, of the committee.

To their surprise and chagrin, the fact was developed that John B. Floyd, secretary of war and a Virginian, had been informed in the August previously that such an invasion was being organized by John Brown and that he took no steps to prevent it. A letter had been mailed to a member of this committee by some unknown person, purporting to have been written to Secretary Floyd from Cincinnati, O., August 20, 1859, nearly two months before the attack upon Harper's Ferry. This letter notified the secretary that such a raid

had been organized to be led by John Brown for emancipation of the slaves, and that it would enter Virginia at Harper's Ferry, probably very soon.

The secretary, when called before the committee⁵ and shown the letter, testified as follows:

"I received this letter last summer in Virginia. My attention was a little more than usual attracted to it, and I laid it away in my trunk. I receive many anonymous letters and pay no attention to them. I do not know but that I should have paid attention to this, notwithstanding it was anonymous, as the writer seemed to be particular in the details; but I knew there was no armory in Maryland, and supposed he had gone into details for the purpose of exciting the alarm of the secretary of war and have a parade. I was satisfied in my own mind that a scheme of such wickedness and outrage could not be entertained by any of the citizens of the United States. I thought no more of the letter until the raid broke out. Then I instantly remembered it and believed the first intelligence that we received from Harper's Ferry to be true, because I recollected the contents of the letter. I had shown the letter to nobody except a member of my family until the outbreak at Harper's Ferry. Immediately after the outbreak the letter was hunted up and published. The object in publishing it was to show that the raid had more significance than a mere local outbreak, and that the country might be put on guard against anything like a concerted movement. I had no means of knowing who wrote the letter. A gentleman in Cincinnati, whom I knew, wrote to me for the letter, believing that the handwriting might be traced. The writer was not discovered, but they had strong suspicions that a certain person somewhere in Kentucky had written it."

Had the warning been heeded, what a mighty change would have been wrought in our country's history! For more than thirty-six years "the Floyd Letter" was the subject of historical controversy. The most skillful detectives were employed by government officials, assisted by experienced experts in handwriting, to hunt down and locate the author. It was believed by Floyd, Mason, Davis, and Governor Wise, that if the author could be found he might be compelled to disclose the names of the persons from whom he learned the facts mentioned, and evidence might thus be secured to implicate prominent abolitionists and republicans in the conspiracy. But all efforts failed. Some have charged that it was written by Hugh Forbes,

⁵See Report of Senate Committee, pp. 251-2.

who was at one time employed by John Brown to drill his men. They had subsequently quarreled, and it was thought by Brown's friends that Forbes had betrayed them. Richard J. Hinton, the author of "John Brown and His Men," believed the letter was written by Edmund Babb, an editorial writer on the *Cincinnati Gazette*, and gives his reasons, supported by some corroborating circumstances.⁶ F. B. Sanborn, another intimate friend, and author of "Life and Letters of John Brown," says: "It has never been ascertained who wrote this letter." He thinks it might have been by a Cincinnati newspaper reporter, who had procured the information from a Hungarian refugee who had fought under Brown in Kansas. "Or it is possible the information came indirectly from Cook, who talked too freely."⁷ The letter has been published in newspapers and magazines, in the report of the senate investigating committee, and in most of the numerous biographies of John Brown. Rev. J. L. Coppoc, brother of Edwin and Barclay Coppoc, thought it was by Richard Realf, the poet, who was one of Brown's associates at Springdale.

In December, 1896, the present author prepared the following account of the origin of the Floyd letter, the purpose for which it was written, and the manner in which its author obtained the information it contained.⁸ After the lapse of thirty-five years and the death of nearly all of the persons connected with the tragic events which inspired it, the only two persons living who had knowledge of its origin and author decided to divulge the long-kept secret and thus settle the controversy.

"In August, 1859, there were living with me in our log cabin on the banks of Rock Creek in the northwest corner of Scott County, Ia., a cousin, A. L. Smith of Buffalo, N. Y., and my youngest brother, David J. Gue, now of New York

⁶"John Brown and His Men," pp. 253-6.

⁷"Life and Letters of John Brown," pp. 543-4.

⁸Published in the *Midland Monthly*, February, 1897.

City. On the thirteenth they drove to Springdale to visit Moses Varney, who was an old friend of Smith. During their stay the exciting topic of conversation among the Quakers of the village was 'Old John Brown' and his men. They had made warm friends among the peaceful people of the settlement, and several young men had gone from their homes to join John Brown's mysterious expedition. Enough had been told to his most trusted friends to arouse fears that the expedition he was organizing could not succeed and must end in the violent death of all engaged in it. On Sunday evening Moses Varney took Smith one side and revealed to him in confidence what he knew of Brown's expedition. He felt that something must be done to save Brown, his followers, and the young men from Springdale, who had gone to join him, from the certain and terrible fate to which they were hastening. When Varney had finished his narrative, so startling and well-nigh incredible as it appeared to Smith, he exclaimed, 'What can we do! What must we do to save their lives?' For two hours they talked and thought of various plans, but came to no decision. When they were about to separate, Varney exclaimed:

" 'Something must be done to save their lives. I cannot betray their confidence in me—consult your friends—but do something!'

"On their long ride home Mr. Smith and my brother tried to think of some plan by which the tragedy could be averted without harm to the stern old emancipator, who was willing to risk liberty and life even for the slaves. In the evening they related to me the fearful secret which had been confided to them by our Springdale friend and Varney's earnest appeal to us to devise some plan to save the little band from almost certain death. We consulted together long and earnestly late into the night, and determined that these young men and their fearless and immovable leader must not be left to march to inevitable defeat and destruction if it were in our power to prevent it.

"Moses Varney had informed Smith that he and several other trusted friends of Brown had used all their powers of persuasion and entreaty to induce him to abandon a scheme so hopeless and so sure to end in the violent death of scores of persons. But no impression could be made upon him. Brown had a prophetic faith that he was ordained to overthrow American slavery, and that the time he had so long waited for had come at last. The preparation of a lifetime seemed to him to have culminated in this plan. He was sure that in some way, not yet clearly developed, he was now leading his heroic band to an assault which would result in the liberation of the slaves. Against such a faith and such devotion no argument or entreaty could prevail. His youthful followers had implicit confidence in their leader and were imbued with the same spirit of martyrdom. The certainty of extreme personal danger made no impression upon these devoted men. We realized that whatever was to be done to prevent the impending tragedy must be in another direction, that if anything was to be done we must do it. We could not betray the confidence of that noble and human Quaker, Moses Varney, who, in an agony of apprehension over the fate of his friends and neighbors, looked to us to devise some way to avert it. We were young and inexperienced in public affairs, but dared not consult older and wiser persons. The night was wearing away and we knew there was no time to lose. It is likely a better plan might have been devised by wiser heads, but this is what we finally determined to do.

"We would send two letters to the secretary of war from different localities, notifying him of the contemplated raid. These letters would give him enough facts to alarm him and cause prompt steps to be taken to guard the national armory at Harper's Ferry. This would become known to Cook, one of John Brown's trusted officers, who was understood to be at that place quietly taking observations preliminary to the attack. He would notify his commander, who could

easily lead his men to safety in that mountain region.

"It was not an easy matter to so word these letters that they should alarm the secretary and lead to prompt action. They must be anonymous, and to spur the department to move at once we considered it necessary to give the name of the leader whose late assaults upon slavery were well known throughout the country. We must carefully conceal from him the possibility of finding out the names of the writers of these letters and the place from which they were written, so that we could not be called upon to give evidence as to the sources of our information, or in any way implicate our Springdale friends with a knowledge of the raid. Neither would we give any names or clue to persons who could be used as witnesses against John Brown or his men if any of them should be arrested. So, in our little log cabin, the letters were written to John B. Floyd, secretary of war. A. L. Smith⁹ wrote one dated Philadelphia, August 18, 1859. It was inclosed in an envelope, sealed, and addressed to the secretary at Washington, D. C., and a stamp put on it. The letter was then inclosed in a larger envelope, sealed, and addressed to the postmaster at Philadelphia. It was mailed at Wheatland, a village in Clinton County. David J. Gue¹⁰ wrote the other letter, which has become historic, of which the following is a copy:

"Cincinnati, August 20.

"Hon. Mr. Floyd, Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.:

"Sir: I have lately received information of a movement of so great importance that I feel it my duty to impart it to you without delay. I have discovered the existence of a secret organization having for its object the liberation of the slaves at the south by a general insurrection. The leader of the movement is 'Old John Brown,' late of Kansas. He has been in Canada during the winter drilling the negroes there, and they are only waiting his word to start for the south to assist the slaves. They have one of

⁹A. L. Smith was a young man from Buffalo, N. Y. He returned to that city, where he became a wholesale merchant and died many years ago.

¹⁰D. J. Gue was about twenty-three years of age at that time. He went to New York City, where he became an artist and portrait painter.

their leading men (a white man) in an armory in Maryland—where it is situated I have not been able to learn. As soon as everything is ready those of their number who are in the northern states and Canada are to come in small companies to their rendezvous, which is in the mountains of Virginia. They will pass down through Pennsylvania and Maryland, and enter Virginia at Harper's Ferry. Brown left the north about three or four weeks ago, and will arm the negroes and strike the blow in a few weeks, so that whatever is done must be done at once. They have a large quantity of arms at their rendezvous, and are probably distributing them already. As I am not fully in their confidence, this is all the information I can give you. I dare not sign my name to this, but trust that you will not disregard the warning on that account.'

"This letter was put into an envelope addressed to John B. Floyd, secretary of war, Washington, D. C., and marked 'Private.' It was then inclosed in a larger envelope directed to the postmaster at Cincinnati, and mailed at Big Rock. We sought to convey to the secretary the impression that the writers of these letters lived in different parts of the country, that they had accidentally learned something of Brown's raid, that they had no sympathy with him and his expedition, and felt it a duty to warn the government of the proposed attack. We hoped in this way to induce the secretary to send a strong military guard to Harper's Ferry, which would at once become known to the old emancipator and avert the dreaded tragedy. But it was not to be.

"We anxiously watched the papers for many weeks to learn whether the letters had accomplished their mission. Two months passed by, and we began to hope the expedition had been abandoned. But on Monday, October 24, the weekly mail brought our *Tribune*, and there we read the fatal news. The blow had fallen, the second battle in the war for emancipation had been fought and lost. John Brown was desperately wounded and most of his little band were killed, wounded, or captured.

"A short time before the execution of the undaunted leader and his surviving comrades, the letter of warning came to light and was published in the principal papers of the country, as related by Secretary Floyd in his testimony

before the senate committee. Whether the other letter ever reached him is unknown. But in the course of his evidence he states that he frequently received anonymous letters and gave no attention to them, among which he mentions one from Philadelphia."

THE HEGEMAN FAMILY.

BY JAMES C. AIKIN.

THE Hegeman Family, was potentially associated with the early history of that part of the present city of New York (borough of Brooklyn) which was known for more than two and one-half centuries as Flatbush. Adriaen Hegeman, the founder of this line, was a settler there, about the middle of the seventeenth century. The Hegeman name is an old one in the Netherlands. It is found also in Germany. Some of the descendants of Adriaen write their name *Hageman*, which form originated in New Jersey, and is used by Rev. Andrew James Hageman of Roycefield, N. J., who has done much valuable work upon a genealogy of the family. One branch of the family fell into the use of the spelling *Hagaman*; and Hagaman Mills, N. Y., was named after them. Others, it seems, have lapsed into *Hagerman*, but they are not to be confounded with the Hagerman line descended from Christopher Hagerman, who fought in the British service on the continent of Europe, against the rebellion in Scotland, and at Quebec, and who settled in Albany County, N. Y., and went thence to Canada at the close of the Revolutionary War—of which line is James John Hagerman of Colorado Springs, Col., the well-known capitalist and railroad builder.

There was a Castle of Heegh (pronounced Hág, the double *e* sounding like *a* in fate), at Didam, Netherlands. It was sold a century and a half ago, and the castle demolished, and there is now only a hunting box there, which the proprietor occupies during the hunting season. Near it are lanes lined

with beech trees of the growth of several centuries, and the moat of the castle still remains. Every part of Gelderland has Hegemans.

The city of Harderwijck had for mayor Jacob Hegeman, who died in 1571. One of his sons was Wolter, a captain in the service of the states-general, who died at the siege of Bronkhorst, in 1582. Another son was Johan, who married Jutgen, and had a son Jacob, who married Naaltje Wolffs.

Nyhoff speaks of a Hegeman in 1414. Sliethenhorst wrote of a Hegemans, born in Harderwijck, as a clever officer.

Wolter Hegeman, mentioned above, was a very conspicuous soldier. It is written that his name and the rumor of his arrival terrified the enemy. At Deventer he captured the works that defended the bridge, and destroyed the bridge. He retook the town of Anhalt and the castle of Hattem.

Duke Willem Van Gelder, in 1402, bequeathed to Jan Hegeman an annuity of fifty gold guilders. Some of the early Harderwijck Hegemans wrote their names Hegheman, Heegman, and Heegeman.

The coat of arms of this family is as follows: Three silver arrows, pointed at each end, in a blue field; *crest*—a silver wing, with an arrow-head projecting vertically through the edge.

Roelof Hegeman was burgomaster of Elberg from 1646 to 1654, and perhaps longer.

Roelof Hegeman was burgomaster at Heerde in 1668.

Adriaen Hegeman, the Ancestor.

ADRIAEN HEGEMAN, with his wife Catharine (Katherij) Margits, arrived at New Amsterdam in the year 1650. He had a son Jacob, baptized in New Amsterdam March 9, 1653. His sons Abram, Isaac, and Denijse (Denyse) are identified as "natives" of this country, and others of his children, Benjamin and Elizabeth, seem to have been born

here; but some of them were born abroad, as Joseph and Henry. The former is described as from Amsterdam.

Adriaen died at Flatbush, Long Island, April, 1672, and his widow in 1689 or 1690. He was a magistrate of Midwout (Flatbush) from 1654 to 1660, and in 1663; he was a schout-fiscaal in 1661 of the five Dutch towns on Long Island. In 1655 he and Thomas Swartwout petitioned the director-general to have the limits of Midwout defined, and Commissary Stryker and themselves were authorized to make the demarcation requested. He obtained a patent, in 1661, for one hundred acres of land in Midwout, and settled upon it. In February, 1664, he procured the making of depositions in relation to the misconduct of an English troop at Midwout, and in the same month he headed a delegation to a convention at Flatbush which was called for the purpose of selecting delegates to lay before the states-general the distressed condition of the country.

Adriaen Hegeman had eight children: *Joseph*, who married Femmetje Remsen Van der Beek; *Hendrick*, who married Ariantje Bloodgood; *Jacobus*, who married Jannetje Ariens Ryerson; *Abraham*, who married Geertruy Janse; *Denijs*, who married Lucretia; *Isaac*, who married Marytje Roelofse Schenck; *Benjamin*, who married Barendji Janse, and *Elizabeth*, who married Tobias Ten Eyck.

Line of Joseph.

Joseph Hegeman, who married Femmetje R. Van der Beek, is described in the marriage record in 1677, at Flatbush, as from Amsterdam. He was a member of assembly from Kings County, 1721-5. He was an elder of the Dutch Church at Flatbush in 1690. In 1710 he purchased the Harlingen tract of land in New Jersey, but it does not appear that he ever occupied it in person. He contended manfully, and at great personal risk, for the rights of the provincials against the administrations that were endeavoring to force episcopacy upon them. He was also in opposition to Act-

ing-Governor Leisler. In 1702 he was a trustee of Flatbush, and as such took part in establishing the boundary between that town and Jamaica. In the year following he sat as a justice of sessions to try certain rioters.

Adriaen, the eldest son of Joseph,¹ married Marijtje Cornell. He settled in the town of Oyster Bay, first at Dosoris (*dos uxoris*), and afterward at Cedar Swamp, so-called, apparently because of its freedom from swamps. (*Lucus a non lucendo.*)

Peter Hegeman, son of Adriaen and Marijtje, spent all his life at Oyster Bay. By his second wife, Magdalena Derje, he had a son Joost (pronounced Yost, and hence written in that way at times), who married Gertrude Hegeman, daughter of Jacobus and Gertrude (Onderdonk) Hegeman. Joost remained at Oyster Bay. His youngest child, Adrian, married Eliza Balster, from Halifax, N. S.

This Adrian was alderman from the fourth ward of New York City, 1805-8, and assemblyman in 1810. In 1821 he was appointed a judge of the marine court, and in 1823 was chief-justice. His oldest child, William, married Eliza Jane Niven.

William Hegeman was the founder of the well-known Hegeman drug house in New York City, in which he was succeeded by his son, Johnston Niven Hegeman. William's youngest child, Elsie Anna, married Hon. Chauncey Mitchell Depew.

William Augustus Ogden Hegeman, commonly known as "Ogden Hegeman," was the oldest child of William. He married Anna Bradford Clark. He was a prominent lawyer of New York City, in partnership with Oliver P. Buel, and died December 24, 1888, leaving two children, Anna B. and Charlotte M. He was indefatigable in tracing the history of the Hegeman Family, and it is understood that his work

¹It has not been found possible to follow "Early Settlers of Kings County" in relation to this family, nor is it safe to accept that useful work implicitly in its distribution into families. The labor was immense and errors crept in.

was methodically arranged, but unfortunately it has not been available to the present annalist, who has taken up the work at a later period; and Hon. Chauncey M. Depew states that it was not found among his effects.

Line of Abraham.

Abraham Hegeman, son of the first settler, married Geertje Janse of Albany. He was a member of the Dutch Church at Flatbush in 1687.

Adrian, son of Abraham, married Adriantje. He was a weaver by occupation, lived in Flatbush, and was clerk of Kings County, 1726-50. His will, dated in 1770, mentions his son Rem as deceased, and names the children of Rem, and, among them, a Rem.

Rem, son of Adrian and Adriantje, died before September 1, 1770, for he is mentioned as deceased in the will of his father. The name of his wife has not been discovered.

Rem, son of Rem, mentioned above, and Sarah Stoot-hoff, had a son Rem, born April 12, 1795, died March 2, 1867. Rem the father was of Flatbush.

Rem, son of Rem and grandson of the earlier Rem, born in 1795, married, in 1815, Helen Wyckoff, daughter of Peter and perhaps of Abigail Lott.

John, son of Rem and Helen, was born February 16, 1816, died October 29, 1845, and was buried in Flatbush. He was married and had two sons, John R. and William R., each of whom was married. The latter was born in 1842, and died November 9, 1891, in Brooklyn. John R. is president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, New York City. He married Miss Evelyn Lyon, and his son, John Rogers Hegeman, Jr., married, October 22, 1895, Elizabeth, daughter of Barak Guitman Coles. John R., Jr., was in 1898 a captain in the One Hundredth Regiment of New York Volunteers in the war against Spain.

Line of Denijs.

Denijs Hegeman, son of the first settler, died in 1703. He married Lucretia, who died January 19, 1734. In 1673 he was a private in Captain Stemnek's company of New Orange, during the Dutch reoccupation. He was a member of the Dutch Church, New York City, in 1675; and in 1693 was on the assessment roll of Flatbush. He was of an enterprising spirit. In 1691 he was sent by Governor Henry Sloughter to treat with the Indians of Pemmaquid, now included in the state of Maine, was seized by the French at Penobscot and carried to Quebec, and was sent thence to France, where he was kept a prisoner for three years. His widow petitioned, June 13, 1703, for compensation for his services. His son, Joseph Denijse, is described as born in Canada, that is, in the region claimed by the French as a part of Canada; and other children, Adriaen and Catharine, are described as of Pemequick. This son, Adriaen, in his will disposed of property in the "Province of Boston," and such property may have been acquired by the father. Denijs was in the census of Flatbush about 1698.

Joseph Denijse Hegeman, son of Denijs, married, June 4, 1714, at Flatbush, Alida Andriesze. His eldest brother, Daalles or Dallius, settled at Six Mile Run, N. J., as early as 1703, whither he was followed by his brother Jacobus. Joseph is described as "born in Canada," meaning in the region claimed by the French as well as by the English. Baptisms of five of his children have been found at New Utrecht. He was received into the Dutch Church at Raritan, N. J., August 19, 1739.

Andries or "Anderis," son of Joseph Denijse, was born November 30, 1719, baptized at New Utrecht December 4, 1719, and died December 28, 1784, at Blawenburgh, N. J. He married, October 17, 1741, Maria Terhune. They were received into the Dutch Church at Raritan in 1751. He was a farmer and a judge of the court of quarter sessions.

Jacobus, son of Andries, was born October 25, 1754, in

Somerset County, N. J., and died November 2, 1779. He married, August 16, 1778, Anne Skillman, of the same locality.

Andrew, son of Jacobus, was born May 5, 1779, and died February 28, 1860. He married Anna Hoagland, was a planter, and lived in Branchburg Township, Somerset County, N. J.

James, son of Andrew, was born February 24, 1808, and died December 24, 1886, at Roycefield in Somerset County, N. J. He married, October 27, 1836, Phoebe Brokaw.

Rev. Andrew James Hageman, son of James and Phoebe, was born October 4, 1837, at Readington, N. J. Married, 1st, Maggie Vrooman Putman; 2d, Harriet Eloise Candee; 3d, Gertrude Annie Cox. He was graduated at Rutgers College in 1860, and at the Seminary, New Brunswick, in 1863; was pastor at Hagaman Mills, N. Y., 1863-87; pastor of the Reformed Church at St. Thomas, West Indies, for three years. Through the winters he renders ministerial services in Florida. He began a genealogy of the Hegemans, particularly of the New Jersey branches, but finding the work to be under prosecution in other hands, on a broader scale, he has co-operated, and has placed his valuable materials at the service of the present annalist.

Line of Isaac.

ISAAC HEGEMAN, son of the first Hageman settler, died in the year 1700. He is recorded as a "native;" married, February 15, 1687, at Flatbush, Marytje Roelfse Schenck. He was ensign of a company of militia in Flatbush in 1686, was commissioned as ensign of a foot company in that place by Jacob Leisler in 1689, and was in the census of Flatbush, taken about 1698.

Adrian, son of Isaac, was baptized September 9, 1688, at Flatbush, and married, at the same place, December 3, 1714, Martha Van der Beek.

Adrian, son of Adrian and Martha, was baptized September 9, 1722, at New Utrecht, and died in March, 1788,

in Flatbush. He married, October 3, 1747, in Flatbush, Sijtje Stryker, who removed to La Grange, Dutchess County, N. Y., after the death of her husband, about 1797. His will, in 1787, describes him as of Flatbush, Long Island.

John Adrian, son of Adrian and Sijtje, was born January 17, 1756, in Flatbush, died January 12, 1813, at La Grange, N. Y., where he was a farmer; married, October 18, 1778, in Flatbush, Cynthia Vanderbilt. He visited Dutchess County (having relatives there), bought land, and removed thither with his family in 1785. Peter Adrian, brother to John Adrian, married Letitia Fletcher, daughter of Captain Nicholas Fletcher. She was an only child and inherited from her mother a farm at Bloomingdale in the city of New York, now bounded by Broadway, Fifty-fourth and Fifty-eighth streets, and the North River. One of their children, who never married, Frances B. Hegeman, born in 1792 and died in 1878, left a large estate. She was considered one of the richest women in the city of New York of that period.

Peter, one of the children of John A. and Cynthia, was born in La Grange, Dutchess County, N. Y., October 20, 1785, died March 10, 1879. He married Phoebe Bogardus, born in New York City, daughter of Cornelius. One of their daughters, Mary Elizabeth, married Joseph Aikin of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., whose son, James C. Aikin (contributor of the present article), of New York City, is preparing a genealogy of the Hegeman Family. William Wallace Hegeman, brother to Mary E., was born in 1827, and died in 1876. He married Harriet E. Allen. He was by profession a lawyer, practiced in New York City and Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and later in life edited for several years the leading newspaper in the place last named. He was elected to the assembly in 1868, and was recognized as a speaker of marked ability. His brother, John P. Hegeman of Kingston, N. Y., was for many years editor and proprietor of the leading paper of that city.

THE RESIDENCE OF JOSEPH BONAPARTE IN NEW JERSEY.

BY FRANCIS BAZLEY LEE.

JOSEPH BONAPARTE, elder brother of Napoleon, member of the council of five hundred, of which his brother Lucien was president, senator and member of the grand council of the Legion of Honor, grand elector and prince of France, conqueror of the kingdom of Naples, and from 1808 to 1813 king of Spain, was, under the title of the Count de Survilliers, for many years a resident of the state of New Jersey, where, in the village of Bordentown, he held an unofficial but regal court in the midst of republican simplicity.

Upon the field of Waterloo the white stars on that eventful night, in 1815, looked down upon the blasted hopes of Napoleon Bonaparte. The fabric of the dream of the modern Cæsar had vanished, the house of the great Corsican had crumbled. The greatest drama of the modern world had closed amid the boom of cannon and the outpouring of streams of human blood. Nothing was left for the Bonapartes but flight to America. In preparing for this course one succeeded and made New Jersey his home; the other, preparing his departure from the Isle d'Aix, laid down his life upon the wave-swept shores of St. Helena.

It was in the brig "Commerce," laden with Bordeaux wines, that Joseph Bonaparte and a small suite, conspicuous among whom was his confidential secretary and friend, Louis Maillard, sailed from France for New York. Three times overhauled by British cruisers searching for Napoleon, the identity of the ex-king of Spain had been so suc-

cessfully concealed that even the Swedish Captain Messervey was not aware of the personality of his passenger. This enforced secrecy was raised on the arrival of the "Commerce" at New York, and, in the City Hotel, Henry Clay, who had just returned from Europe, having negotiated the treaty of Ghent, surrendered to Joseph Bonaparte a suite of rooms which had been engaged by the distinguished American.

From New York Joseph Bonaparte proceeded to Philadelphia, where he resided on the site of the Bingham House, and where, during February, 1824, Joseph Lucien Charles Napoleon was born to Prince Charles and his wife Zenaide. Another home occupied by Joseph Bonaparte was "Lansdowne," in Fairmount Park, Philadelphia, a superb establishment, former residence of John Penn, last proprietary governor of Pennsylvania. Here, too, had dwelt Mr. Bingham, grandfather of Lord Ashburton. Subsequently Joseph Bonaparte's city residence was in Girard Row, on Chestnut Street. The story goes that Joseph offered to purchase from Stephen Girard the block from Eleventh to Twelfth and Chestnut to Market streets. The price was to be silver half-dollars covering the tract, laid flat. This offer Stephen Girard would accept solely upon the condition that the half-dollars be set on edge.

Two motives probably influenced Joseph Bonaparte to settle in New Jersey. One was the sentiment of his brother Napoleon, who had once said in the presence of Joseph that in case of failure of his plans and the need of flight he would locate his home somewhere between Philadelphia and New York, where, said Napoleon, pointing to a map, "I can receive the earliest intelligence from France by ships arriving at either port." The other was the evident willingness of the legislature of New Jersey to pass an enabling statute permitting an alien to hold land in fee simple. Unquestionably Joseph Bonaparte had selected Trenton as his future home, he having negotiated for a house in that city.

The greed of the land-owners, and the fact that Commodore Charles Stewart urged the claims of Bordentown, influenced Joseph Bonaparte in favor of the latter place. During the autumn of 1816 and the spring of 1817 the ex-king of Spain, through agents, acquired title to about one thousand acres of land lying on the bank of Crosswick's Creek, between its former mouth and the village of Groveville. This estate, known as "Point Breeze" and "Bonaparte's Park," had in part been located by Thomas Farnsworth in 1681, had been purchased from the Farnsworths by Joseph Borden, thence had passed to his son-in-law, Joseph Douglass, who devised it to his son, George Douglass. In 1792 George Douglass made an assignment to Trenton's most famous merchant of revolutionary times, Abraham Hunt, from whom the land passed into the control of Stephen Sayre, once private secretary to Benjamin Franklin and former high sheriff of the city of London. Although having experienced reverses, Sayre had been most instrumental in securing foreign aid and money for the cause of independence. The Sayre interests, together with a race track as a part of the realty, were transferred to Joseph Bonaparte in 1816, when Stephen Sayre ceased to occupy the property, subsequently dying at the home of his son, Samuel Wilson Sayre of Brandon, Va. Thus before "Point Breeze" became the home of a king the property was historic.

With characteristic energy and the love of the beautiful that so marked the æsthetic rather than the military nature of Joseph Bonaparte, he immediately adorned his new estate. Gardeners planted trees, laborers laid out several miles of carriage drives, while a frame house, in which Bonaparte—now known as the Count de Survilliers—resided, was removed and a substantial mansion, partially of brick and wood, was erected. From the cellar of this house an underground passageway, according to Major E. M. Woodward's "Bonaparte's Park and the Murats,"

was constructed, leading some fifty feet away to the bluff facing the creek. Many are the fanciful traditions told concerning the passageway, of its use in case ships of European powers should come up the Delaware in search of the ex-king of Spain, who roamed at will about the streets of New York and Philadelphia, and of the possibility of dark deeds being committed by those witty, agreeable, peace-loving gentlemen who brought to Quaker Bordentown so much French verve, spontaneity, and sunshine! The tunnel had its use—a ready means of conveying to the mansion the pipes of wine, casks of liquor, and such provisions as came from Philadelphia or later were brought by canal from New York.

But upon the 3d of January, 1820, an accidental fire destroyed a portion of the "elegant mansion of Joseph Bonaparte" while its owner was in Trenton. Fighting the flames by means of the primitive bucket brigade, in which the women of the village assisted, the citizens of Bordentown were enabled to save much of the articles of furniture, ornaments, paintings, plate, jewels, linen, books, and money, of which there was a great store in the mansion, and all of which was returned to the Count de Survilliers intact. For these services the distinguished Frenchman highly complimented the "dignity" of the townspeople and their appreciation of the fact that "true greatness is in the soul." The ruins of the house, which stood near the main entrance to the park, were pulled down, leaving standing only a stone-inclosed observatory.

In the erection of a new home the Count de Survilliers exceeded the elegance of any mansion in the state. Converting a stable, which stood in front of his former residence, into dwelling purposes, his dwelling, says Woodward, "was plain, long, and rather low, and of brick covered with white plaster." Liveried servants stood by the carved folding doors at the entrance, while within was a wide hall and staircase, a state dining room, art gallery, and library,

with a wealth of sculpture, of paintings by old and modern masters, of hangings in gold, and of tapestry fringed with silver—in short, the home of a prince, where hospitality, princely in name and in fact, was dispensed to the unbounded admiration even of those Americans accustomed to the display of European courts. Through the park, whose drives of twelve miles amid statuary were like those of the Escorial grounds,—a remembrance of the ex-king's life upon the throne in Madrid,—were rustic cots, rain shelters, and bridges. From a tidal lagoon the Count de Survilliers created a lake half a mile in length, erected a causeway on the Trenton road, leading a drive over a costly arch. Around the lake a carriage-way opened vistas of beauty—now a glimpse of the sunlit Delaware, there among the trees swans encircling islets, or the sound of laughter and song from those in a little fleet of boats as they accompanied the count upon those pleasure parties of which he was so fond.

Near the residence of the count stood the "Lake House," erected for Prince Charles and his wife Zenaide, and which was connected with the mansion of the Count de Survilliers by a subterranean passage, used by the princess, his daughter, when, during inclement weather, she visited her father. Another passageway with heavy doors led from the lake to the main house. As in the case of the "tunnels" associated with the mansion destroyed by fire, there were various idle stories. How little foundation there was for rumor may be found in the Italian inscription which, by order of the count, was carved over the doorway of one of these passages:

Not ignorant of evil, I learn to succor the unfortunate.

Except for the absence of his beautiful but delicate wife, Marie Julie Clari, whose sister became the queen of Sweden, and who, by reason of the severity of a sea voy-

age, was unable to join the count in his exile, Joseph Bonaparte was supremely happy in his new home. The presence of his eldest daughter, Zenaide Charlotte Julie, princess de Canino and Musignano, and wife of her cousin, Charles Lucien, son of Lucien Bonaparte, gave to the sumptuous entertainments of Count de Survilliers an air of graciousness that only such an accomplished woman could lend. While in America she read and translated Schiller's dramas. As a scientist and founder and president of several Italian scientific congresses, Prince Charles Lucien was best known as an ornithologist. Associated with him was the eminent naturalist, Alexander Wilson, and in the many works of these two savants there are innumerable references to bird-life in the Delaware Valley. The contiguous "Pines," the natural habitat of rare species of birds, as well as the Crosswick meadows, the division line between the distribution of the Carolinian and Appalachian fauna, were thoroughly explored by this princely student, whose days were spent in woods, on farms, and along streams in search of useful and curious information concerning birds and their modes of life. Of the children of the marriage of Prince Charles Lucien Bonaparte and Zenaide one was the Prince de Musignano, who inherited all the American realty of the Count de Survilliers except the farm at Groveville. Another child was the Marquis de Roccagiovine, another was the Comtesse Primole, while another was Napoleon Gregoire Jacques Philippe, who served in Mexico under Marshal Bazaine.

The youngest daughter of the Count de Survilliers was Charlotte, who married her cousin, Napoleon Louis, Grand Duc de Cleves et Berg, who, under the regency of his mother, was for a short time recognized as king of Holland. The grand duke was also a man of scientific attainments.

In personal appearance the Count de Survilliers had, in spite of a tendency toward corpulency, a graceful figure. He was of less than medium height, and by his temperance,

keeping seasonable hours, and constant exercise, he preserved to its full a strong constitution. He much resembled his brother Napoleon, having a complexion "peculiar and striking, as smooth and transparent as a woman's."

Of his life at Bordentown it may be said that it combined the elements of leisure, usually dignified, the study of men, books, art, and nature, and a willingness to disclose the splendors of his home to the humblest as the most conspicuous of his friends and acquaintances. Whether throwing apples and oranges upon the ice when skaters sought his lake, presenting Christmas gifts to the poor, giving work to a small army of retainers whom he employed, or welcoming Lafayette, Clauzel, Lallemand, Desnouettes, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, John Quincy Adams, General Winfield Scott, Commodore Charles Stewart, Commodore Robert F. Stockton, or members of the government of the state of New Jersey, there was always in his every act the spirit of the king, a gracious, generous monarch who had fallen upon sad days. Whatever bitterness, whatever sorrow, there was in his heart he kept to himself. Of pastimes he was perhaps fondest of billiards, and played the game in the old fashioned way. It was a delight for him to teach this sport to those young Americans who came to his house, and one of his apt pupils was the late Colonel Morris R. Hamilton, for many years librarian of the state of New Jersey.

It was in 1824, upon the occasion of General Lafayette's visit to America, that the Count de Survilliers welcomed the guest of the nation, who had left Philadelphia by steamboat. He also later entertained General Lafayette, who had received an ovation in Trenton, and who spent a night at the park after a wildly enthusiastic reception at Bordentown. It was at Point Breeze that Joseph Bonaparte refused the proffer of the crown of Mexico, saying that he had worn two crowns, but "would not take a step to wear a third." Profoundly impressed by the republican institutions of the United States, he told the deputation:

"I do not think that the throne you wish to raise again can make you happy," and advised the Mexicans to copy the policy of their neighboring republic. Here too, when in exile, came Napoleon III, who resided during a part of the year 1837 in New York City.

The accession to the French throne of Louis Philippe was the signal for the granting of partial pardon to those of the Napoleonic dynasty who had been expatriated. Under such circumstances the Count de Survilliers visited Europe in 1832, receiving upon the occasion of his departure from Bordentown and Philadelphia the assurances of the high consideration in which he was held by the people, who had learned to know and appreciate him. But once in Europe, he was subjected to the bitterest attacks, his motives were ignorantly misinterpreted or wilfully misunderstood, and, seeking consolation in America, he returned to Bordentown in 1837. For two years he travelled extensively and prepared for a return to England, where he went in 1839, dying during 1844, in Florence, Italy, at the age of seventy-six.

The death of the Count de Survilliers devolved upon his grandson, Joseph Lucien Charles Napoleon, Count de Musignano, the ownership of all the realty of Joseph Bonaparte in America except a farm of two hundred and fifty acres near Groveville, which the Count de Survilliers gave by will to Louis Maillard. Succeeding his grandfather, the Count de Musignano, "Prince Joseph," as he was called, resided in Bordentown at the "Park" until the time of the Revolution of 1848, when he returned to France. But "Prince Joseph," who did not care for the farms, or in fact for America, sold one part of the estate and then another until August 11, 1847, when the "Park" was sold to Thomas Richards. In 1850 Point Breeze was purchased by Henry Beckett, British consul at Philadelphia, a son of Sir John Beckett of Somerby Park, Lincolnshire, England, and a direct descendant of Deputy Governor Andrew Hamilton

of Pennsylvania. It was Mr Beckett who destroyed the Bonaparte house and erected nearby a then modern structure, which after various vicissitudes is now occupied by the priests of the congregation of the mission of St. Vincent de Paul, whose head house and missionary center is in Germantown, Philadelphia. By these priests the "Park" is used as a place of recreation and has been improved, attempts having been made to restore some of the former beauties of the estate.

Into the life of the sedate, the elegant, the accomplished Count de Survilliers dashed the figure of his nephew, the reckless, dare-devil, money-wasting Napoleon Francois Lucien Charles, Prince Murat, son of Joachim Murat, king of the Two Sicilies. To this kingship Joachim Murat, son of an innkeeper, had risen from a sub-deaconate in the church, and until he became the favorite of Napoleon Bonaparte, whose sister Caroline he married, had been lieutenant of chasseurs, waiter in a restaurant, and then lieutenant of cavalry. When came the empire Murat rose to marshal prince, king of the Two Sicilies, commander of the "grand armee" in its retreat from Russia, and at last was court-martialed and shot by Italians, while he was attempting to stir the peasants to insurrection.

In 1803 Prince Murat was born, and having practically attained his majority, followed the fortunes of his uncle and came to America. Settling first near Columbus, N. J., he soon purchased the "Roebuck" plantation near the park, where he lived in a house built upon the plan of an Italian villa. Subsequently he resided on the Chesterfield road, but the home best known was "Murat Row," on the edge of the Park, now used for tenements, but which in its day, with stuccoed front dormer windows and abundance of shade, was, as it yet is, one of the "lions" of the village. Then the old, old story was told, this time to Miss Caroline Georgina Fraser, daughter of Major Fraser of the British army. The usual private marriage followed, performed by

the Rev. Frederick Beasley, rector of St. Michael's Protestant Episcopal Church in Trenton and father of the late chief-justice of the New Jersey supreme court, Mercer Beasley. Both the prince and his American princess were handsome, both charming. But neither family was satisfied. The Bonapartes said that Murat should have married one of his cousins in Europe; the Frasers took exception to the idiosyncrasies of the prince. His serene highness would go deer hunting in the "Pines" and make champagne punch in a bucket; he had spent seventy thousand dollars in farming and raising or trying to raise horses, dogs, and cattle. He had the unfortunate habit of sitting by the roadside and gambling with hostlers, of throwing gold half eagles into barrooms, or curing balky horses by setting fire to wisps of straw placed under them. He was always in debt, and had wasted his sister-in-law's fortune in a chimerical scheme to build a city on the Black River in New York. From Joseph Bonaparte Prince Murat obtained money, while his wife conducted a private school, and in these ways they were able to keep a pretence of princely dignity, and thus enabled the prince to visit France upon several occasions. Here, after the election of Louis Napoleon to the presidency of France in 1849, Murat became senator, and in 1860 put forth a claim to the kingship of the Two Sicilies. With him during these years, when he had spent his money, his devoted wife lived, sharing his fortunes, until their deaths in 1878.

All is passed of those glorious days, when a king lived in Bordentown. The end indeed came in 1845, when the auctioneer's hammer scattered much of the rare furniture, now so greatly prized, the statuary, paintings, books, the china plate and cut glass, that made the "Park" an enchanted spot. The good old king has gone, the roystering prince, the faithful Maillard, the student Prince Lucien, who kept his birds by the lake—all have crumbled into dust. Time has broken out the windows of the houses in the "Park,"

the lake is a morass, vines creep along the roads. There are only echoes of splendor of a kingly court far more brilliant than that held by the Earl of Stirling at Basking Ridge, by Governor Livingston at "Liberty Hall," by the Stocktons at Morven—the triune homes of abounding hospitality in the early days of New Jersey.

And when years ago some one said: "Never has been seen such magnificence in New Jersey," it was one of the most distinguished men of the state, Commodore Stockton, who replied: "Ah! but who could hope to rival a king?"

A COMING NEW YORK CENTENARY.

NEW YORK will soon reach the hundredth anniversary of an event in its history which, while it may not be the occasion of any very formal celebration, was of the greatest importance in connection with the ultimate development of the city. On the 3d of April, 1807, the legislature of the state passed "An act relative to Improvements, touching the laying out of Streets and Roads in the City of New York." Although at that period the designation "City of New York" comprehended nominally all of Manhattan Island, the named streets terminated with North Street (now Houston), above which the thoroughfares, both lateral and northerly, were mere wagon "roads" and "lanes," built in the progress of time for the accommodation of traffic or for private convenience. Even the boldest speculation could not have conceived an urban growth which, within any conjecturable time, would absorb those miles upon miles of open country, for the most part waste land. But it was within the perception of every one that more space would soon be needed by the advancing city; some far-seeing minds deemed it advisable that the future extensions should follow a uniform plan of municipal construction; and the act of 1807 was framed and passed with this purpose primarily in view.

As commissioners under the act three citizens of the highest probity were presently appointed, who were to serve without compensation: Gouverneur Morris, the eminent statesman, Simeon De Witt, the state engineer, and John Rutherford, formerly United States senator from New Jersey. Vested with absolute powers, and easily able

—probably without remark in those days of low land values —to incidentally promote private property interests of enormous subsequent advantage to themselves or their descendants, these commissioners discharged their responsible duties with an integrity and single-minded loyalty to their trust never questioned then or since. Their final report and map were not submitted until March, 1811. The scheme of street and avenue arrangement which they recommended was adopted without alteration, and, in its broad features, has been carried out exactly, although various modifications in details have been instituted, especially in the development of the more northerly portion of the island of Manhattan.

Their plan embodied the following fundamental principles:—first, a uniform rectangular disposition of thoroughfares; second, those running north and south to be styled “avenues,” with long distances between, and those running east and west to be called “streets,” at short distances apart; third, both avenues and streets to receive numerical names—First, Second, Third, etc. In justification of this programme, an entirely unique one at the time, the commissioners said:

“One of the first objects which claimed their attention was the form and manner in which the business should be conducted; that is to say, whether they should confine themselves to rectilinear and rectangular streets, or whether they should adopt some of those supposed improvements, by circles, ovals, and stars, which certainly embellish a place, whatever may be their effects as to convenience and utility. In considering that subject, they could not but bear in mind that a city is to be composed principally of the habitations of men, and that straight-sided and right-angled houses are the cheapest to build and the most convenient to live in. The effect of these plain and simple reflections was decisive.”

The prolongation of Broadway, the old “Middle Road,” as the principal thoroughfare of the old city running in a northerly direction, was provided for. The original plan of the commissioners contemplated, however, the termination of Broadway at Twenty-third Street, where an exten-



HENRY BREVOORT.

(From a Print in Possession of Grenville Kane, Esq.)



sive "Parade Ground" (reduced to the present Madison Square) was laid out. The further continuation of Broadway was due to an afterthought in the practical development of the plan of the city as received from the commissioners.

It is not generally known to New Yorkers that the somewhat abrupt turn of Broadway at Tenth Street was the result of a concession which the city found it necessary to make to a private property owner. The circumstances of this concession, later involving the interruption of Eleventh Street at Broadway, are of much interest.

At the time when the commission was pursuing its labors, there stood, on land opposite the present intersection of Eleventh Street and Broadway, the old Brevoort mansion. The house, of stone, was so situated that Broadway, if prolonged in a straight line from Tenth Street, would come inconveniently close to it, while Eleventh Street, if opened as projected, would quite obliterate it. The owner, Henry Brevoort, had acquired the residence, with its surrounding land, as his inheritance upon the subdivision of the old Brevoort estate, which was originally a farm of some eighty acres, embraced within the present bounds of Third and Sixth avenues and Ninth and Eighteenth streets. Cherishing much pride in the ancestral home which had thus fallen to his portion, he had remodelled all of the building except the room in which he was born, and naturally opposed a strenuous resistance to street openings which would have caused its destruction.

To slightly alter the line of Broadway so as to avoid an unpleasant legal controversy—Mr. Brevoort being determined to accept no money easement—was of course a convenient matter, and was, indeed, considered desirable, it being found that the proposed alteration of the Broadway line would give to that street above its intersection with Tenth an exact north and south direction. (It may be remarked that to the present day, of all the streets of New

York, this portion of Broadway alone runs due north).

On the other hand, the abandonment of Eleventh Street for the accommodation of a personal property interest was a serious affair. But in this contest Mr. Brevoort, and after him his heirs, took the same uncompromising stand. After repeated endeavors to open the street—ordinances on the subject being passed as late as the 'forties,—the city finally gave up the struggle. Imagine at the present day a serious private offer of opposition, on sentimental grounds, to a legitimate city improvement in even the remotest section of the least populated borough of the greater city! The thought is grotesque. But in those days such details as the shifting of the course of New York's principal street and the cutting off of another street were unconsidered trifles.

BOOK NOTICES.

Captain Myles Standish. By Tudor Jenks, author of "Captain John Smith." The Century Company, New York, 1905; 250 pages; \$1.20.

A plain and unadorned narrative, from which fiction, doubtful romance, and sensational heroics are eliminated, this life of Captain Standish might well be commended as a model to writers who have an ambition to utilize in some striking and novel sort the abundant dramatic materials of our colonial history. It is suggestive of a few easy rules for these aspirants, guaranteed to work satisfactorily in every case:—familiarize yourself with the subject selected; devote an honest investigation to the available authorities; and let such unrestrainable faculty of "imagination" or "interpretation" as you possess be expended upon the related actual aspects of the matter, which will be found instructive, strange, far-spreading, and fascinating enough.

The merits of Mr. Jenks's story of Standish are its particular lucidity, its confinement to the absolute facts of his career, and—an indispensable thing in any work of historical biography—its secure grasp of the momentous history with which that career is associated and of the connected social and economic conditions. Unconsciously perhaps, Mr. Jenks has given us in this book an essay in brief on the times, as well as an excellent summary of the general history of the Pilgrims and of the colony which they founded down to the death of Standish.

In the popular imagination Myles Standish is a man who bore some part, doubtless creditable enough, in early New England affairs, but chiefly to be remembered as the awkward and ridiculous suitor, by the proxy of John Alden, of the fair Priscilla.

Longfellow's trivial fabric of the "Courtship of Miles Standish" is shown by Mr. Jenks to be a myth, hardly deserving of notice in view of the undoubted virility of the man as well as of certain facts of personal chronology. Upon his arrival in New England Standish was a widower—demonstrably possessed of experience, and presumably of a masterful or at least shrewd capability, in love as well as war. His second wife was a sister of his first, and, says Mr. Jenks, quoting Good-

win, "seems to have been sent for not less than a year before Priscilla's marriage, for she arrived on the 'Anne' in 1623 and was married so promptly that she had lost her maiden name on the ensuing land division. There is little reason for supposing that she was not the first and only person thought of as her sister's successor." "It seems a pity," adds Mr. Jenks, "that the only tradition in connection with him should be that trifling one about Priscilla Mullins and John Alden, and it is to be hoped that historians will see to it that this story, like that about Captain Smith and Pocahontas, should not be allowed to remain in the minds of young American readers while the really important facts about these two brave, honorable, and forceful men are forgotten."

The History of Arizona, from the Earliest Times Known to the People of Europe to 1903. By Sidney R. De Long. Written under the Auspices of the Pioneer Historical Society of Arizona. The Whittaker and Ray Company, San Francisco, 1905; 199 pages.

Pronounced in sonorous accents—as we have heard it delivered by reading-clerks in our great national conventions,—the name Arizona is one of the finest in the roll of the American commonwealths, remarkable as that roll is for dignity and euphony. It is but natural to conjecture that some poetical or at least pleasing associations will be found connected with its origin. But Mr. De Long discards all fanciful derivations of the word, and says: "The probability seems to be that it is a whole sentence in the Papago language, and really means, to give it a liberal interpretation, 'a place where the innocent children were tormented and slaughtered,' from *ari*, children, and *zona*, where scourged and slaughtered. In 1695, or about that time, in the vicinity of Tubutama, now Sonora, a Lieutenant Solis, of the Spanish army, committed and ordered committed some great atrocities, punishing the innocent for the acts of the guilty; among the acts putting to death at one time fifty who had come in as peaceful. After this, as great numbers of the children had been butchered, the Indians, especially the squaws, upon coming into that vicinity, kept repeating, 'Ari-zona, Ari-zona' (This is a slaughter ground), until it was designated and known by that name, and it gradually spread and has named this territory, and wrongfully perpetuates the infamous acts of a subaltern of the Spanish army of occupation."

But however wrongful the designation, the history of Arizona until very recent times has been quite consistent with the evil character given

it in this popular tradition. Throughout the Spanish rule and the succeeding sway of Mexico, the peculiar ferocity of the Indian tribes which dominated the country prevented its settlement, speedy massacre being the fate of all white men who adventured thither, except in military force; and the early occupation and development of the country under the government of the United States were attended by strife and slaughter most cruel, indiscriminating, and persistent. For this unhappy beginning of the present promising civilization of Arizona, Mr. De Long holds the Indians wholly responsible. His conclusions are expressed in terms so striking that any summary would be inadequate.

"The great impediment to Arizona's progress has been the Apache Indian, who has always been at war, even when at peace, paradoxical as it sounds. These Indians have always shown themselves the determined foe of all civilization, and have never, so far as is known, had other means of living than by plunder,—a band of the human race who have ever plumed themselves upon the amount they could steal and rob from others, yet who perfectly comprehended the law of right and wrong when applied to themselves; for no one could proclaim his wrongs more vociferously than an Apache Indian were the least thing taken from him. The Apache Indian, as a whole, is one of the worst characters that has ever been brought forth upon this earth, unless it may be said that all races have passed through the same phases in their advance from the lowest stages of barbarism up to civilization. It could not be said that the Apache Indians inhabited any country. They roamed over the country and by their ruthless, exterminating wars prevented more peacefully inclined tribes, even of their own race, from settling down to cultivate the soil. Cruel, rapacious, indolent, with no redeeming quality except patience to lie in wait and attack weaker parties when least expected and at most advantageous points, these Indians were for centuries a terror and a scourge to all northern Mexico, Arizona, New Mexico, and even extended their raids into Texas. Arizona was settled through many privations and much slaughter. The advancing tide of civilization has borne in its front a windrow of human bones. A large part of the most venturesome and hardy of the advance guard of pioneers were sacrificed to the ruthless spirit of the savage by the tender-hearted and self-styled philanthropists of the older communities of the United States, who could sympathize with the savage but had no feeling for the sufferings of their own race."

Appreciation of this phase of the special difficulty of Arizona's settlement is necessary to a just understanding of its seeming backwardness in development. The final acquisition of the territory from Mexico did not occur until 1853, the first territorial government was not organized

until February 20, 1863, and by far the largest part of the period since has been required to win the conditions of security and order indispensable for any general measure of settlement.

Aside from the prime drawback (now a matter of the past) upon which Mr. De Long lays such stress, Arizona is not, he says—and convincingly shows,—under any inherent disadvantage. Vast injustice has always been done to that territory by an ignorant popular prejudice, which regards it as a desert waste, incapable of sustaining an agricultural population. He points out that the great valleys of the Gila, Salt, and Colorado rivers embrace agricultural lands of the best quality, exceeding the combined area of Vermont, Rhode Island, and Delaware—the problem of irrigation, common to the entire far west, remaining, of course, to be solved. Arizona possesses, moreover, an unsurpassed mineral wealth, which, with the general progress now begun, promises an astonishing development.

Mr. De Long's book is an admirable history of the informing rather than the minute variety, presenting the essentials of the subject in a clear and able narrative.

Wisconsin in Three Centuries, 1634-1905. Narrative of Three Centuries in the Making of an American Commonwealth. Illustrated with Numerous Engravings of Historic Scenes and Landmarks, Portraits, and Facsimiles of Rare Prints, Documents, and Old Maps. Board of Editors and Writers: Reuben Gold Thwaites, Secretary State Historical Society; Hon. Emil Baensch, Curator State Historical Society; William Ward Wight, M. A., President State Historical Society; Joseph Stephen Laboule, D. D.; Henry Edward Legler, Curator State Historical Society; Henry Colin Campbell, Secretary Board of Editors and Writers. The Century History Company, New York; published by subscription; four volumes, respectively, 360, 311, 328, and 354 pages.

Wisconsin occupies a unique position on the North American continent, which, considered from the viewpoint of its relations to the great and prolonged rivalry between France and England for continental mastery, was of supreme importance. Within its territory, at more than one point, the drainage basins of the great lakes and the Mississippi come into close touch with one another, affording a near approach to that geographical phenomenon found in South America, where the vast north and south systems of water communication are not only actually but navigably united. Thus by several short portage

routes—the most feasible being the one between the head waters of the Fox and Wisconsin rivers,—the early explorers, adventurers, and traders of "New France," from their established settlements on the St. Lawrence, could go by boat, with but slight interruption, to the Gulf of Mexico at the south and the Rocky Mountains at the west. The advantages consequently enjoyed by France included control of the fur trade of the entire country west of the Alleghenies, alliances in war with numerous and powerful Indian tribes, and a strategic mastery of the Valley of the Mississippi, by easy means of communication from Canada at the east and Louisiana at the south, which, for a perfect development, required only a few decades of settlement.

It is in this aspect, and the closely related one of what might have been, that the history of Wisconsin possesses its chief interest; and if the extended work before us had no other merit than an adequate account of the French régime, it would be a notable addition to our historical literature. As a record of that picturesque early time it is exceedingly complete and intelligent. Yet little more than one of the four volumes is devoted to the French period. With equal minuteness and ability the story of the transition years, of the organization of Wisconsin as a commonwealth, and of its subsequent prosperous career is told.

The authors, their associates, and the publishers are to be congratulated upon a result seldom equalled in an American state history. In the accessory respects of execution the work will meet the expectations of subscribers; paper and binding are of an acceptable order, and the illustrations are numerous and most valuable.

Michigan: Its History and Government. By Webster Cook, Principal of the Saginaw High School, Saginaw, Mich. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1905; 270 pages; 90 cents.

This is the latest of the admirable series of handbooks on the states and their governments issued by the Macmillans, under the general editorship of Lawrence B. Evans, Ph.D., professor of history in Tufts College—the preceding volumes being devoted to Minnesota, Maine, New York, Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana.

It makes no pretensions as a detailed work, but is a comprehensive summary of the elements of the subject, from the history of Michigan to the distinguishing aspects and characteristics of its constitutional and

administrative system. A book primarily for the student, it is written and arranged with great clearness to serve this fundamental purpose; each chapter is prefaced with copious citations of the principal published authorities, and the aim of exact information in concise form is held uniformly in view. The appendix includes in full the famous Ordinance of 1787, the supplemental act approved August 7, 1789, the act admitting Michigan as a state, and the Michigan constitution.

Washington and the West: Being George Washington's Diary of September, 1784, kept during his journey into the Ohio Basin in the interest of a commercial union between the Great Lakes and the Potomac River; and a commentary upon the same. By Archer Butler Hulbert, author of "Historic Highways of America," etc. With Maps. The Century Company, New York, 1905; 217 pages; \$2.

George Washington's interest in the development of the west—meaning in those times the country directly beyond the barrier of the Alleghenies—may be said to have begun with his earliest career. In 1753, when only twenty-one years old, he made a journey across the mountains, of which he left a record in manuscript notes on the subject of the navigation of the upper Potomac, and which resulted in a plan formulated by him when a member of the Virginia house of burgesses six years later for improving the Potomac and connecting it with the Ohio. From that time until the end of his life measures for encouraging settlement in the west and bringing that region into commercial touch with the east occupied a foremost place in his conceptions of public policy. In 1770, in correspondence with Thomas Johnson, later governor of Maryland, he discussed with much seriousness the project of Potomac improvement "as a means of becoming the channel of conveyance of the extensive and valuable trade of a rising empire." With the establishment of American independence his views upon the importance of western development and the creation of some artificial junction between western and eastern navigation became very decided; and the tour of which this volume is a record was undertaken in the year following the peace with Great Britain. His appreciation of the possibilities offered by the west finds a highly practical illustration in his large personal holdings of western lands, aggregating many thousands of acres in western Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, the "Northwest Territory," and Kentucky.

The text of Washington's Diary is supplemented with statistics of distances and a "Summary," all carefully copied from his original notebook; and Mr. Hulbert has added a valuable commentary, the result of a personal itinerary of the country traversed by Washington. The book is the most noteworthy of recent contributions to Washingtoniana from original sources.

The Twining Family (Revised Edition). Descendants of William Twining, Sr., of Eastham, Mass., where he Died 1659. With Notes of English, Welsh, and Nova Scotia Families of the Name. Compiled and published by Thomas Jefferson Twining, Fort Wayne, Ind., 1905; 251 pages; \$2.75.

The ancestor of this family, William Twining, first appeared at Yarmouth, in the Plymouth Colony, in June, 1641. He brought with him from the old country a wife and two children, Isabel and William, Jr.; and although married a second time (1652) does not appear to have left any other issue. His daughter Isabel became the wife of Francis Baker, and their descendants are numbered by the thousands. William Twining, Jr., was born in England about 1625, married Elizabeth Deane, and had two sons and three daughters. The author has brought down the male lines to the eleventh generation, with some incidental attention to female descents. Supplemental pages are added upon the English, Welsh, and Nova Scotian Twinings, with a statement of what is known concerning the Twining arms, and other miscellany. Numerous half-tone illustrations are included.

Benjamin F. Barge, 1832-1902. His Life—His Travels. By Mrs. C. Stanley Hurlbut. Allen, Lane and Scott, Philadelphia, 1905; 212 pages.

Benjamin Franklin Barge was a descendant in the third American generation of a substantial Pennsylvania family, originally from Alsace. No European lineage has been found for him, and indeed his ancestral line is restricted to his father and grandfather, both of whom were prosperous farmers and worthy citizens, but not in any way men of prominence. His own life was not one of distinction as the word is usually understood: he did not figure in public affairs, or in a marked manner in any of the familiar departments of individual activity. Yet his career is eminently worthy of the record made of it by his niece, Mrs. Hurlbut; and while this volume is intended more as a family memorial than

for general circulation, it is a welcome addition to the biographical literature of our times.

An accomplished scholar; in early life engaged in important educational work; afterward a very successful merchant; a most generous philanthropist, noted in this respect for the intelligent discrimination of his gifts; an extensive and keenly observing traveller—Mr. Barge was a man representative of the soundest cultivation and highest personal standards. By the force of an individuality known to all for pure nobility, he exercised a valuable influence in Philadelphia and Pennsylvania. His benefactions were especially directed for the relief of suffering in the most direct and speedy ways, as in emergencies caused by sudden catastrophies. He was the largest private contributor in the state of Pennsylvania for the benefit of those made homeless by the Galveston cataclysm, and a corresponding liberality, almost as immediate as the events which called it forth, was shown to the victims of other calamitous occurrences. In his will he made extensive distributions of money to charitable institutions, and large bequests for educational purposes, especially to Yale University. Mrs. Hurlbut's book is a faithful record of this honorable and beautiful life.

Maryland: Stories of Her People and of Her History. By L. Magruder Passano, A. B., Author of "A History of Maryland for Schools." Williams and Wilkins Company, Baltimore, 1905; 228 pages.

Pacific History Stories, Montana Edition. By Alice Harriman. The Whittaker and Ray Company, San Francisco; 198 pages.

Both these books are excellent examples of aids to historical study by the method of selecting a few prominent phases and presenting them in a familiar manner and with attractive illustrations. Mr. Passano's Maryland "Stories" are capitally told, with the important merit of brevity. The Montana book belongs to a series of "Western Readers," edited by Harr Wagner and adapted in each case to the special history of the state under consideration; and Miss Harriman's work has been done with marked taste in the choice of topics and in an entertaining narrative style.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

CONTENTS

Frontispiece: Gouverneur Morris.

New York in the Nineteenth Century. By John Austin

Stevens. (*Second Paper*) 201

Witchcraft in Connecticut. By Forrest Morgan . . . 216

The Authorship of the Kentucky Revolution of 1798. By

Ethelbert D. Warfield, LL.D. 239

The Morris Family of Morrisania. By W. W. Spooner . 259

Book Notices 268

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE is issued on the fifteenth day each of January, March, May, July, September, and November, at Three Dollars per annum, Fifty Cents per single copy. Subscribers failing to receive their copies by the first day of the succeeding month should immediately notify the publishers; otherwise it may not be possible to supply the missing number.

The contents of each number are protected by copyright. Permission to reprint any article or illustration must be specially obtained from the publishers.

Advertising rates will be furnished on application; none but strictly high-class advertising matter will be admitted. Advertisements must be received by the fifteenth day of the month preceding the month of issue.

Application made at the New York Post Office for entry as second-class mail matter.

THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK,
Publishers,
41 Lafayette Place,
New York, U. S. A.

Copyright, 1906, by
THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK.

All rights reserved.



Lord Morris

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. I

MAY, 1906

NO. 3

NEW YORK CITY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BY JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS.

Second Paper.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE PERIOD—COMMERCIAL EXPANSION. 1800-25.

(From a historical address.)

FROM its earliest beginnings New York has been a trading city. Founded by the Dutch, commerce was its chief, indeed its only business, during their rule, and the incoming of the British changed the direction but not the nature of its trade. Beaver-skins, which the wild country produced in abundance, were then in great demand in Europe, and with flour were the chief articles of export, while the import list included about everything needed in the daily economy of life.¹ The narrow policy of Great Britain, which held her colonies to be of right tributary to herself, did not favor home manufactures in America, yet they had their beginning here in the Stamp act period, 1765. The Chamber of Commerce, the first American society of that order, was founded in 1768 when the repeal of the revenue acts seemed to favor a revival of trade with the mother country. Its motto, "*Non nobis nati solum*" (We are not born for ourselves alone), was a proud one, and well suited to a city which thus early was showing cosmopolitan tendencies;

¹The old seal of the city and province was significant. It bore the arms of a windmill with a flour-barrel and a beaver as supporters.

although New York had not as yet taken first rank as a commercial port. The strict observance by her merchants of the non-importation agreement deprived her of four-fifths of her trade, but when the Revolution was over and the chief restrictions removed, she entered with eagerness on her onward career.² The complications with France toward the close of the century somewhat interfered with this progress, but in 1800 New York was already the first commercial city of the continent. Of the six hundred and sixty thousand tons of United States shipping, she had over one hundred and six thousand tons, and of the seventy-one million dollars' value of exports fourteen million dollars' value fell to her share—not wholly of her own product, but in some, and a yearly increasing measure, of the southern staples. There was a regular packet service with Falmouth in England and the port of L'Orient in France; and she had sent out her first venture to the China seas, thus opening that trade which our recent acquisition in the Philippines has now secured and will hereafter secure to our enterprise. It is of interest to note that the first vessel to the China seas, the "Empress of China," sailed from New York on the anniversary of Washington's birthday in 1784.

The period from 1789 to 1807 was the halcyon period of American commerce, especially of New York commerce. The struggle of England with Napoleon threw a great part of the carrying trade of the world into our hands, but the jealousy of Great Britain soon interfered with this prosperity; and in 1797 a statute checked the transport of many articles, even of American product, in other than

²Her natural advantages were perfectly understood. As the headquarters of British military forces, she had attracted the attention of the colonies and of foreign powers, and when peace was declared enterprising men flocked to her from every quarter. And here the great influence of the pushing New Englanders must not be overlooked as one of the chief motors in her rapid development.

British vessels, a measure which has been aptly termed "war in disguise." This was the first arrest of our commercial progress. The final blow, however, came from our own government in its declaration of non-intercourse and of the embargo of 1807; which, unfortunate though it proved, was in the unprepared state of the nation for warlike measures our only possible answer to the orders in council, which sought to compel all maritime trade to pass through British ports. A year after the declaration of the embargo the exports from the United States had fallen from one hundred and eight millions to twenty-two millions' value; from New York to less than six millions. The distress in New York was without example; the wharves, warehouses, and stores were deserted, mechanics without work, laborers idle, and grass—in fact not metaphor—growing in the thoroughfares. One hundred and twenty mercantile houses had failed in an amount exceeding five millions of dollars. Five hundred vessels lay rotting at the wharves, and thousands of sailors roamed about the streets, wandered into the neighboring country to the alarm of the farmers, or in desperation entered the British service. Even the farmers had given up raising produce for which there was no sale. Yet this was the very year that commissioners were appointed to lay out the streets of the city on an imperial plan.³ In this year also the waters of the Hudson saw their first steamboat.

From statutory interference Great Britain soon passed into active aggression, until, our patience exhausted, the United States, in June, 1812, declared war. This may be

³Their novel but wise provision for regular longitudinal avenues and traverse streets at regular intervals has been adhered to, and their alphabetic and numeric naming maintained. Objection has been made to the uniformity of the laying out of these thoroughfares, which divested the city of its picturesqueness; but the wisdom of the commissioners is again patent when the danger of curves in our rapid transit surface system is considered. As well object to the levelling of the hills which once made city travel weary to man and beast.

called the close of the first era of United States commerce. The interregnum between it and the beginning of the second lasted to 1817; even the Chamber of Commerce suspending its meetings, which had been uninterrupted for the entire period of the Revolution, through the decade.

Some note may be made of the uncertain state of our relations with England during the embargo. In 1806 a British frigate fired on an American vessel off Sandy Hook and killed one of her crew. The body was brought to New York and buried at public expense amid intense excitement. In 1807 the "Chesapeake" was overhauled off Hampton Roads by a British cruiser and a sailor was taken off. In 1811 Commodore Rodgers, in the "President," disabled a British sloop of war which had committed a second act of impressment. In 1812 the war fever ran high, but the merchants of New York, John Jacob Astor at their head, still believed, and so addressed congress, that "a continuance of the embargo and non-importation laws a few months beyond the fourth of July next will effect a complete and bloodless triumph of right," and Massachusetts followed in the same line. It was amid this excitement that George Clinton, New York's favorite son, and vice-president of the United States in the last term of Jefferson and the first of that of Madison, died in office. His remains were honored in New York by a splendid "solemnity"—a funeral procession to the sound of salutes from the fort and an address by Gouverneur Morris at the new Presbyterian Church in Wall Street.

But in the universal distress occasioned by the lethargy of industry and the apprehensions of property, there were some bright spots. War brings its own occupations and excitements. While Madison's declaration of hostilities in June was reluctantly received by the merchants and men of property, the seafaring men hailed it with delight. The fighting blood was again stirred. The old colonial passion for privateering revived. Within four months twenty-six

privateers, armed with two hundred and twelve guns, were fitted out. Nor were our six United States men of war idle. An hour after receiving his instructions Commodore Rodgers, who was at New York, put to sea, and three days later, in the "President," exchanged shot with a British frigate, drove it from our waters, and chased the Jamaica plate fleet to the very chops of the channel. The next month Porter, with the "Essex" and the flag, "Free Trade and Sailors' Rights," attacked a fleet of transports under escort; Farragut was a midshipman on this cruise. In July also Captain Hull, in the "Constitution," won honor by his famous escape from a nest of British cruisers, one of which was the "Guerriere," a pride of the British navy; and catching her alone shortly after, engaged and destroyed her. He brought the captain and crew prisoners to Boston, and then made a triumphant progress to New York, where swords were presented, the freedom of the city was voted, and his portrait was painted. The old "Ironsides" still lives, a training ship for our young sailors. In the winter Decatur, who had sailed from this port in the United States, brought in the "Macedonian" captive. The same honors were paid to him, and a dinner given to the crew. He brought in his prize on the first of January, 1813, always a festive day in New York. He had been banqueted two days before at the City Hotel, where five hundred gentlemen sat down at five o'clock. During this year 1813 Commodore Bainbridge and Captain James Lawrence, a New York boy, repeated the sea triumphs of Hull and Decatur, and were alike honored, though New York was too closely blockaded for them to bring their prizes in. Moreover, more than three hundred British merchantmen had been captured by privateers. These craft were chiefly built in New York, where there were three large ship-yards—those of the Browns on the East River, the Bergs near Gouverneur Slip (where the "President") was built, and the Ecfurds, who constructed the ships on

the lakes as well as Commodore Chauncey's flagship, the "Oneida." The largest of the privateers was the "General Armstrong," which mounted eighteen long guns and one twelve-pounder, and was manned by one hundred and fifty men.

During this military period there were four arsenals in the city, the State Arsenal, corner of Elm and Franklin, the United States Arsenal on Bridge Street near the South Battery, the United States Magazine and Arsenal at the foot of West Twelfth Street, and the United States Arsenal on the Parade, now Madison Square, at the junction of the Old Boston Road and the Middle Road (upper Broadway). This was the parting of the roads to Bloomingdale and to King's Bridge. Some of the trees which shaded the old highway still show its route through the square.

In 1813 an English squadron under Admiral Warren was reported off Sandy Hook, and the city was in alarm. General Ebenezer Stevens, a continental officer, was in command of the artillery of the state and of the state forces generally, with the rank of major-general. The forts in the harbor were under command of Colonel Henry Burbeck, also of revolutionary fame; the navy-yard and flotilla under that of Captain Isaac Chauncey. In July the English Admiral Warren issued his proclamation of blockade; relieved from service in the continental wars there were eighty English men of war on our coast. In September the city was in grief over the bodies of Lawrence and Ludlow, who had fallen in the unequal fight between the "Chesapeake" and the "Shannon" off Boston harbor. The line of march of the procession was from the Battery through Greenwich Street to Chambers and Broadway to Trinity Church. There were twenty to thirty thousand people on the line of march, and the services were conducted by Bishop John Henry Hobart.⁴

⁴The route chosen shows the line of chief habitation and its upper limit on Chambers Street, the northern boundary of the City Park.

In 1814 Captain McDonough, who saved the state from its second invasion by his victory on Lake Champlain, received the usual honors from the New York common council. The privateers, of which New York fitted out fifty-five, were again busy. The "Governor Tompkins" brought in a vessel from the Madeira Islands with a cargo worth sixty thousand dollars. He had fallen in with and chased a British frigate, but fortunately got out of the scrape. The "General Armstrong" captured the "Queen," armed with sixteen guns with a cargo worth three hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and off Surinam engaged a British frigate of twenty guns—mistaking her for a privateer,—but got safely away. In July the British sloop of war "Eagle" was captured in New York waters by a fishing smack fitted out in the city, whose crew at the signal word "Lawrence" boarded, captured, and brought the enemy in without firing a shot.

The defences of New York had been studied in 1798. There were two plans—one of Aaron Burr of Martello towers; the other that of Mangin, which was adopted. General Stevens built the Governor's Island works for temporary defence. He favored the use of sandbags, a judgment later vindicated by their successful employment at Morris Island in Charleston Harbor by the confederates; knocked over every day, they were restored under cover of darkness until a calcium light sent from New York prevented the nightly repair.

In 1807 the city was defenceless; no fortification outside of the Narrows or Hell Gate. The United States government was tardy, and not until 1814 was there any change. Then the common council, alarmed by the British vessels off the harbor, called a public meeting over which Colonel Rutgers presided, and undertook its own defence. Castle Clinton (later known as Castle Garden) was built at the Battery; Fort Columbus and Castle William were erected on Governor's Island; some works on the river; Fort Rich-

mond, a strong work, on Staten Island; Fort Tompkins in its rear, and Fort Hudson on the shore line. Fort Stevens commanded the rough waters of the Point on the East River (the present Astoria), which again was overlooked by a round tower on a height in its rear. There was also a work on the New York bluff opposite. McGowan's Pass was strongly guarded by a blockhouse, the ruins of which are still to be seen in Central Park, and which made one of a system of works across the island. Twenty thousand men were raised by requisition of congress, and the entire force was placed under command of General Stevens. Tompkins was then the governor of the state. During the entire war period De Witt Clinton was the mayor of the city, and though he was opposed to the war in the beginning, he was tireless in her defence.

The Republican party, which ruled New York by a large majority, was divided into two sections, the Madisonians, whose headquarters were at Tammany Hall, and the Clintonians, who were also called Martling men from the name of the keeper of the tavern in whose long room they met. Both Tammany Hall and Martling's were in Nassau street. Clinton, in disgust with the party dissensions, resigned in 1815. The name democrat as applied to a political party was first used by the republicans at the charter election of 1816. The federalists in general supported Clinton.

The news of the Treaty of Ghent, signed the Christmas day previously, reached New York in twenty-six hours from Washington on Saturday, the 11th of February, 1815. It was announced at a concert at the City Hotel, and instantly the town was in rejoicing with impromptu illuminations. A grand public dinner was voted by the corporation and an illumination ordered by the common council was generally observed. The war was over, and New York again set to work to recover from its sacrifices and continue its march of progress, but the war had made sad changes. Many of the men who were rich at its beginning were ruined; their

ships idle in every creek, their warehouses and stores full of mouldy produce or damaged goods, and the currency in a state of utter demoralization, while the government credit was at low ebb. The recovery was rapid; as rapid indeed as that earlier recovery from the War of the Revolution. In 1816 the Erie Canal was begun near Utica on the Fourth of July—"Clinton's ditch," it was called in derision. In 1819 the first savings bank was founded by John Pintard.⁵ In 1822 the first life insurance company was established.

⁵A name to be forever held in honor in our history for his devotion to the higher interests of the city and his inauguration of institutions of charity and education. He was the chief founder of the New York Historical Society in 1804, and he led the way in the revival of the Chamber of Commerce in 1817. He deserves a monument. A printing press had been established in New York by William Bradford in 1693, on the site of the present Cotton Exchange, and here the *New York Gazette*, the first newspaper printed in New York, was issued by Bradford in 1725.

Hanover Square was still, during the first quarter of the century, as it had been for the latter half of that preceding, a great trade center. The importing houses of European goods had their stores here. The great ships lay on the East River front, which was gradually pushed into the stream by filling in—first of the Strand (now the Pearl Street) line to Water, then to Front, and finally to South, the fame of which was world-wide till the Civil War. Since the abandonment of the Old Royal Exchange on the corner of Pearl and Broad, there had been no general business mart. The foundations of the new Merchants' Exchange on the site of the present Custom House were not laid until 1825. The daily resort of the merchants was the Merchants' Coffee House in the new Tontine Building on the north-east corner of Wall and Water streets. The lower half of Wall Street was the home of the insurance companies. At its foot was the Coffee House Slip, which divided the vendue or auction business with Hanover Square, chiefly, however, for the sale of heavy goods from the West Indies. Auctioneer Row was here. The river streets, as they were constructed one after the other, were filled with warehouses and stores for goods from the West and East Indies—cargoes of sugars and molasses, coffees and teas, and spirits from France, Spain, England, and the Madeira Islands. The west side growth on the Hudson was more slow and of minor importance up to the end of this quarter of the century, and until the internal improvements by water brought in the products of the interior. We have the authority of Mr. Verplanck, the noted antiquary and "Yorkino," that up to 1825 there had been but little change in the physical features of the lower end of the city, the section below the Park; this was the chief seat of fine residences also, although there were scattered buildings as high up as Bleecker Street, and a Presbyterian church in 1825. The promenade of the fashion was on the west side of Broadway from Warren Street to Grace Church below Trinity. The City Hotel, on the site of the old Province Arms, corner of Broadway and Thames Street, was still the chief tavern. The Battery was the children's playground by day, and a favorite resort. There were fine houses with balconies on State Street, one of which remains a witness of the old charm, and there were stately residences on lower Broadway.

The foundations of the new City Hall were laid in the Commons with

The freedom of the ocean again assured, Isaac Wright and Francis Thompson in 1815 established the Black Ball Line, a monthly service of first class packets to Liverpool, which was long known as the Old Line. Soon after they established a second line, the ships sailing fortnightly from each port, and these were followed by other lines until in 1827 there were twenty-four ships on the four Liverpool lines. The average speed of the ships was twenty-two days outward and twenty-nine days home. The Swallow Tail

much ceremony in 1804, and here the beautiful structure has remained, a model of graceful architecture, but today with incongruous surroundings. Here, however, is the centre of the business activity of the Greater New York.

The upper part of the Third Ward, with the City Hall Park as its eastern boundary, was the home of the well-to-do merchants, and was styled "the Silk Stocking Ward." The residences, mostly of two stories and an attic, and covering a twenty-five foot front, were on the cross streets—the rectilinear streets, Chapel Street (with the exception of College Place) and Church Street being given up for shops for household supplies.

The great merchants, like their prototypes of Venice, were the leaders of society in all its phases. They were a proud race, and looked upon the professional men as a subordinate class, since the clergyman, the lawyer, and the physician were paid for their services. But the days of ten thousand dollar fees for legal and medical advice had not yet arrived. The tone of society, however, was high, and culture was held in esteem, to an extent only those of us who have survived from this period appreciate how thoroughly. New York was then a college town, and old King's (now Columbia) College, with its learned presidents and professors, most of whom were of old Knickerbocker stock, was the center of literary and scientific activity. And not less did the charming college grounds, with their lawns, terraces, and shade trees, affect the local atmosphere.

Society was divided in its religious views. What remained of old colonial New York gathered at the Episcopalian Chapels of St. Paul's, Grace, and Trinity, when rebuilt; the Dutch Reformed at the Middle Church on Nassau Street; the Presbyterians, which included nearly the entire New England element, at their new structure in Wall Street or the brick meeting house on the south side of the Park. Of a Sunday whole families, seniors in the lead and juniors in the rear, marched through the streets in family procession after the fashion of the church-going gentry as seen in the old Dutch pictures. In their daily lives they were not less regular. A hearty breakfast at eight, for there was no time to waste on lunches by business men in the first quarter of the century; this over, the householder walked to Washington or Fulton Market on his way to his counting-house or store, and personally selected his daily provisions from the boundless supplies of fish, flesh, and fowl, fruits and vegetables, at prices which we can hardly believe in these days—a bushel or barrel of food being bought for a price less than it now costs to send it home. The dinner hour was three o'clock, but it was common to return to the counting-house or store in the afternoon and see all shut up for the night. The five o'clock fashion had not yet come in, but the tea-table was well-laden and a supper of shell fish, lobsters, crabs, and oysters was not unusual at nine in the winter evenings. In the summer ice-cream was peddled at the doors and often consumed on the porch steps in the open air. Coaches were rare, but the distances were not great.

Line, which maintained its service till 1876, was the last survivor of the great fleet whose days of arrival and departure were maintained with a regularity hardly exceeded in these days of steam. A Havre line was started by Fox and Livingston in 1824, with twelve ships soon after. The captains of all these vessels were courteous men, some of them of high education, and their memory is cherished by many a passenger.

In 1822 the city was again smitten by a great calamity, and the yellow fever, which had appeared twice before in the century—first in 1803, when its victims numbered seven hundred, and again in 1805, when three hundred died from it,—again broke out with a virulence before unknown. The city was depopulated by the exodus of everyone who could get away. The banks and public offices were removed to the village of Greenwich, where Bank Street remains, its name a reminder of the visitation. The deaths in the city were over twelve hundred.

As yet steam was in its infancy, though no novelty to the people of New York. John Fitch had experimented with it on the Collect Pond in 1788. Not until 1807, however, was its practical use demonstrated by Robert Fulton, who put the "Clermont" on the Hudson in that year. It was soon to prove a powerful agent in the development of trade by the conveyance of freight, as well as in its facilities to travel—to distribute the vast products which the canals brought to our wharves. Ocean navigation by steam had its practical beginnings in New York. Fitch in 1792 had expressed the opinion of his friend Rittenhouse that "this would be the mode of crossing the Atlantic in time." The prediction was realized in 1819, when the "Savannah," a steamship built at Corlear's Hook by Crocker Fitchlatt, made her trial trip to Savannah and thence to Arundal, a port in Norway. She had paddle-wheels, which were taken in when the weather was heavy, yet made her homeward trip in nineteen days. The New York legislature incor-

porated an ocean steamship company this same year, but regular steam communication with Europe was not to come in this period—and the application of that motor to land traffic also was as yet in the future.

The water system of internal improvements was already begun in this first quarter of the century, the pioneer work of enterprise being the building of the Lake Champlain Canal. This begins at Whitehall, at the head of sloop navigation on that vast body of water, and is the outlet for the produce of a large section of country. It was completed in 1823, and with the Hudson established a navigation of three hundred and forty-five miles. Valuable as it was as a feeder to New York commerce, and an outlet for its trade with the interior, it was insignificant when compared with the Erie Canal, which was not finished till two years later.

The vast importance of the Erie Canal to the city of New York had long been foreseen and was not overestimated. It is to the development of this natural advantage that the city chiefly owed its rapid progress in the second quarter of the century. Many claims have been made to the priority of its conception, which it is needless here to discuss. In 1786 Christopher Colles invited the attention of the Chamber of Commerce to "a design which he had formed of opening an intercourse with the interior parts of the United States by an artificial inland navigation along the Mohawk River and Wood Creek to the Great Lakes, a design which must eventually extend the commerce of this city with exceeding rapidity beyond what it can possibly arrive at by any other means; a design which Providence has manifestly pointed out, and which in the hands of a commercial people must evidently tend to make them great and powerful." He had memorialized the legislature, which granted him aid in his surveys; he had personally examined the obstructions in the navigation at the Cohoes Little Falls and Fort Schuyler. He had even procured a number of sub-

scriptions and invited the aid of the Chamber, which as a corporate body they were unable to give, but they entertained "the highest idea of the utility of his scheme." This is the only unbroken waterway from the vast system of western lakes, with their boundless adjacent lands, to New York City, and its importance is as great to-day as at any time in its history. It is at once a great feeder of our commerce and at the same time a safeguard against railroad monopoly, for in these days of capitalization a union or an understanding between the managers of the Erie and Central systems is not only possible but extremely probable. Fortunately our legislature has declared itself in favor of a thorough utilization of this water highway. The opening of this great canal made New York the water gateway of the continent, and realized in a material form Milton's sublime vision, "the opening wide of ever-during gates on golden hinges turning," to the abundant riches of the incomparable valleys of the west. This beneficent enterprise opened for New York a line of sixteen hundred and sixty miles of waterway into the very heart of that prolific region.

The section of New York State between Albany and Lake Erie, the two ends of the canal, is unequalled in its possibilities of industry in a variety of ways; and the lake region beyond is of boundless fertility. The increase in the tolls of the canal tells the story of its value to New York City. From 1823 to 1900 they rose from \$119,908 to \$92,786,712. Two other important canals were also undertaken at this period: the Ohio Canal from the Ohio to Lake Erie, a feeder and virtually a part of the Erie, which alone could bring its freight to tide-water, and the Morris Canal of New Jersey which, destined to serve the manufacturing enterprises of the city, as yet in their infancy, proved of the greatest importance. It ran through the matchless coal region of the Lehigh and a section of country rich in lime and free-

stone, marble and metallic minerals, all indispensable to the building up of the metropolis.

Yet with all this promise for the future there were times of depression and difficulty. The Republican party of Jefferson and Madison had little talent for administration; it was neither willing to keep peace nor able to conduct war. Disregarding the advice of Gallatin, Madison had refused to renew the charter of the Bank of the United States; since which the financial condition of this country had gone from bad to worse. Already in 1813 the credit of the United States had been saved by three great capitalists, who came to its aid at the call of Mr. Gallatin, then secretary of the treasury. It is pleasant to remember that one of these was John Jacob Astor; the others were David Parish and Stephen Girard. During the war the specie of the country, little at best, had gradually disappeared. New banks had sprung up all over the land, and paper money was the only circulating medium. In 1815 the burning of Washington by the British brought on a general panic and a collapse of the flimsy fabric. In the country the depreciation of the local currency ranged from seven to twenty-five per cent.; in New York from seven to ten per cent. Specie payments were suspended, and it was not till 1817 that with the aid of a second Bank of the United States, which was chartered of necessity the year before, that resumption was attempted. Specie to the amount of seven millions was secured from Europe, and trade resumed its regular course.

The foreign trade of the port of New York was, December 31, 1824: Tonnage registered, 128,702; licensed, 132,443; imports of merchandise, value, \$37,783,147; exports, value, \$22,309,362; total foreign trade, \$60,092,509. The importations of merchandise at New York in 1825 exceeded those of the five other principal ports of the union; she was already the great commercial emporium of the continent.

Mr. Dix, the one economic authority on this period, considered the contingency that external trade may be changed

for internal trade, but said that New York would still be a purely trading city; a contingency which cannot arise until the United States not only manufactures all that it requires, which is probable, but that we will consume our surplus product, mineral and agricultural, which does not now seem at all possible—unless, perhaps, the rest of Europe intends to migrate to America. Indeed, the demand from abroad for not only our agricultural, but our manufactured product, seems to increase as fast as our ability to supply it. This distinguished gentleman, who was a true New Yorker, although of New Hampshire birth and New England training, closes his most interesting and philosophic study with the following words: “There is no mention on record, ancient or modern, of so rapid a growth as the city has had since its liberation from the embarrassments of colonial servitude, and it is confidently to be believed that its growth will continue undiminished until it transcends the bounds of every commercial city in Europe.” This is already true if the comparison be made between our condition to-day and the condition at the time he writes of. The relative conditions, however, have changed since his declaration was made. All over Europe there is a growing trend of population to the great cities; the wonderful growths of Berlin and Hamburg in the last ten years are notable instances of a sudden rise in population, while those of London and Vienna have moved in more regular but still startling progression.

WITCHCRAFT IN CONNECTICUT.

BY FORREST MORGAN.

THAT there are materials for such a chapter is simply restating the fact that the settlers were seventeenth century English. That the materials are so scanty, relative to those for England at the same period, evinces that the New Englanders were much superior to the mass of English. That their being products of their time, with the same stock of information and beliefs and the same practical inferences from both, should be matter of denunciation or pharisaical sarcasm, is discreditable to human rationality. With equal justice might we revile the society of the fourteenth century for eating with their fingers or believing in the divinity of the Holy Roman Empire. All that could be asked, and more than could be hoped, would be superior readiness to make social outcome the test of religious theory; and such they had. They would be entitled to lenient judgment had they been something less ready in place of more; for while all Christians accepted the Bible as it stood, their own society was built up on the Bible—on its fervent acceptance, its studious interpretation, its upholding against tradition or custom or authority the attempt to bring their social life into general accord with its precepts. As teaching and as literature it filled their lives; for many years they literally had nothing else. It is creditable to their common sense that they fell into so little barbarity or absurdity in attempting to apply obsolete systems of thought and practice to their own lives.

Regarding their action, it is to be observed that as in

other communities, the extirpation of witchcraft confined itself mainly to local nuisances or suspects, Ishmaelites, or independent thinkers,—those out of favor with the respectability or inertia of the community; in short, when members of the latter were involved, though the theory was not for the moment discredited, the evidence began to be scrutinized with great care, and the canons made so severe that practical results failed. This must never be forgotten in discussing the intellectual status of communities. They made witch-hunting a branch of their social police and of their desire for social solidarity. That this was wrong and mischievous is granted; but it is ordinary human conduct now as then. It was a most illogical, capricious, and dangerous form of enforcing punishment, abating nuisances, and shutting out disagreeable truths; fertile in injustice, oppression, the shedding of innocent blood, and the extinguishing of light. No one can justify it, or plead beneficial results from it which could not have been secured with far less evil in other ways. But it was natural that, believing the crime to exist, they should use the belief to strike down offenders or annoyances out of reach of any other *legal* means. They did not invent the crime for the purpose, nor did they invent the death penalty for this crime. We impute a cruelty to them which has no basis, because we shrink from the infliction of the death penalty as that age did it. They saw no more cruelty in putting this particular sort of criminal to death than any other.

One other general remark is called out by the non-recognition of it in most writing on witchcraft. The skeptics—who were never such as to the abstract existence of witchcraft, but only as to its existence in their own community, or the adequacy of the explanation in individual cases—formed but a small part of the whole body of suspects. The majority were as firm believers in the black art as their accusers; they believed that though personally innocent, they were surrounded with those not so, that very

likely those indicted as accomplices had really committed sorcery, and not only so, but the actual piece of sorcery charged. That this had been in fact committed, they no more thought of doubting than a man wrongfully accused of murder doubts that the murder has taken place. Not to admit this is to suppose that the social riffraff had an invariable monopoly of advanced intelligence and clarity of mind. There is nothing to justify such an idea; yet it is tacitly assumed that the alleged witches and wizards in all cases were the only ones in the community free from the delusion, and were not merely protesting against the sacrifice of their own lives unjustly, but against what they believed to be in its own nature falsehood and perjury. If we disabuse ourselves of this notion, and remember that they probably thought merely that suspicion for a real crime had fallen on the wrong person, we shall understand better how they could confess in their crazed anguish to the commission of the crimes of which they had heard all their lives, and could involve others in the same doom.

The number of lives taken for this cause in colonial Connecticut seems to have been nine, all in the years 1647-62; but the 1647 case is dubious, and the number may not be above eight. After 1662 no more blood was shed here on this ground; some reasons are suggested later. In the exact half-century (1647-97) between the first indictment and the last, allowing the doubtful case, twenty-eight persons in all were accused of the crime before the courts of Connecticut and New Haven colonies,—seven of them, or one-fourth, in a single “flurry,” that of 1662; three were in New Haven, 1653-7. Three other convictions of guilty were found besides those followed by executions; but as the courts either set aside the verdicts or released the convicted, they belong to the credit side. Communities are judged by the final action of their superior elements, not by the intentions of their lower. New Haven apparently escaped all share of the bloodshed by having judge instead

of jury trial—there was no difference in belief or law, and certainly no superior personal humanity, witness the much harsher treatment of the Quakers,—and that judge the governor, Theophilus Eaton, a gentleman of exemplary sense and moderation. Men of superior station were not always exempt from the frenzy of the mass,—witness the Salem craze; but in general their experience would undermine the bigoted self-confidence of the more ignorant, and their station exempted them from either annoyance or ridicule by the social pariahs, of whose dread the lesser goodmen and goodies rid themselves by sending them to the gallows. We shall see reason to surmise that this acted on the Connecticut as well as the New Haven magistrates.

The foundation of the witchcraft laws was the Mosaic code, on which the Puritan colonies based their catalogue of capital crimes; both New Haven and Connecticut make the same citations, Ex. xxii:18, Lev. xx:27, and Deut. xviii:10, as authority. The first, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," was evidently regarded as binding as any other commandment; why not the second, commanding the witch to be stoned to death, is one of the distinctions drawn by every age in theological matters as related to practice, for the meditation of the outsider. But as their legislation was not to conflict with the English, there was a more direct precedent in the British statute of 1603, passed immediately after the accession of James I., and as a graceful compliment to his 'Demonology.' The Connecticut law of 1642 reads, "If any Man or Woman be a Witch, that is hath or consulteth with a Familiar Spirritt, they shall bee put to Death." The New Haven statute of 1655 is, "If any person be a Witch, he or she shall be put to death, according to" the list of Scripture texts above.

The first capital case in Connecticut is always assigned to (March) 1646-7, on the clear statement of Winthrop's Journal of that year: "A Person of Windsor was put to Death on the Charge of Witchcraft at Hartford." This is,

however, a very perplexing matter. There is no entry of any such case on the records of the Hartford particular court, where all the witchcraft cases for the neighboring towns were tried, and where every other case is set down, nor in the local annals of Windsor or Hartford, though as the first case it must have been a great sensation in those little towns, and the next one was carefully written up. Nor is it at all certain that the entry was made at that time: it is in a large blank space at the end of the year 1646, and may have been later information written in and misdated, especially as Winthrop seems not to have been told the victim's sex. On the other hand, he did not invent it outright, and if a mistake it must be a confusion with some one else; but it can in that case be no one but Mary Johnson following; and to suppose that on hearing of the execution of a witch from Wethersfield a few weeks before his death (and there is a good probability she was not executed till long after it), he turned back the leaves of his diary and mis-copied it into a place two years earlier as one from Windsor, is so extraordinary an improbability that it would seem much easier to believe that the records are wrong. Yet though this seems a simple explanation, it is in this case so difficult to support that we are left in a blind alley. Local records may yet turn up and throw light on this case.

The first certain execution was that of Mary Johnson ("Jonson") of Wethersfield, at Hartford, in 1649 or 1650. On December 7, 1648, a "Bill of Indictment" was framed against her, "that by her owne Confession, shee is guilty of Familiarity with the Deuill." She appears to have been an unchaste and light-fingered servant-girl, who two years before had been whipped for "Theuery" (if it was the same Mary Johnson). Whom she had bewitched, or how, we have no statement (all we know is from Mather's "Magnalia"); but finding she was to be hanged in any event, she furnished a very satisfactory "confession," which if the "Deuill" is omitted is probable enough. She was discon-

tented with her work, and perpetually wishing the Devil to take certain things, especially disagreeable household duties; one was cleaning out the ashes, and many thousands in the time of the great old-fashioned fireplace have probably echoed her aspiration. Satan obligingly complied with her wish, and on one occasion drove the hogs out of the yard when they had broken in. She also confessed that she had "committed uncleanness both with men and with Devils," and murdered a child (quite likely her own). She was said to be "very Penitent." Servant-girls were more plentiful then than now, or the community would not have spared her, even for the luxury of an *auto-da-fe*. She was probably not hanged till the spring of 1650.

The petition of Uncas to the united colonies of New England, in the winter of 1649-50, to protect him from the sorceries of other Indians, is hardly relevant to our subject. Connecticut was asked to appoint a committee to look into it, but seems not to have acted; and would have had a diverting time examining Indian deponents and passing sentence on Indian culprits, *in re* the question what was normal and what was abnormal in an Indian.

On February 20, 1650-1, an indictment was found against a Wethersfield carpenter named John Carrington, and his wife "Joane," in common form, for having "Intertained ffamiliarity with Sathan, the Great Enemye of God and Mankinde," and accomplished wonderful works past human power by his aid. We note again that though convicted they were not hanged till March 19, 1653. These long imprisonments suggest that the Connecticut magistrates were trying to do indirectly what the New Haven ones could do directly, and release the prisoners after public excitement had cooled down. Unfortunately they had not the same power. There is a reasonable possibility that they would have escaped, however, but for the Bassett and Knapp cases, all four being hanged together in 1653, in a sudden exacerbation of feeling.

The next two cases seem to have been closely connected. The connection should be emphasized, because neglect of it has been made the basis of some virulent detraction of an important man. The earlier was of Goodwife Bassett, at Stafford, in 1651; the later of Goodwife Knapp, at Fairfield, in 1653. These two towns had a particular court in common, with joint magistrates sitting alternately in the two; that of Fairfield was its founder, Roger Ludlow, one of the leading founders of Connecticut. All we know of Goody Bassett is that Governor Haynes and two magistrates went down to "keepe Courte uppon her Tryall for her Life," after May 15, 1651. She was hanged; we cannot tell when, perhaps not till 1653. One of the efforts of the prosecutors and promoters of the prosecution at each trial was to have the witch name her fellow-witches, so that all might be rooted out; and the frantic victims, out of mental break-down, or honest belief in the crime having been committed, or vengeance or mischief, would often involve others, so that it is remarkable this ninepin system had not brought on a holocaust of murders long before the Salem times. It would seem that Goody Bassett had hinted at some one in Fairfield, without giving names, and suspicion vacillated between Goody Knapp and the young wife of one Thomas Staples; at last it fixed on the former, who was tried, convicted, and hanged—almost certainly early in 1653. Her case is the most painful in the entire Connecticut list, for she impresses one as the best woman:—how the just and high-minded old lady had excited hate or suspicion, we cannot know.

The loss of the court record (carried off by Ludlow) deprives us of any direct account of her indictment; the whole matter was brought out in a libel suit which followed. While Mrs. Knapp was in prison she was beset as usual, by the gossips of the town, to name her accomplices. They were especially insistent with her to name Mrs. Staples; their unscrupulous pertinacity, according to

their own testimony, was enough to have worn out the constancy and broken down the fibre of any one living, but was powerless, for a while at least, against her upright firmness and honor. They were especially insistent with her to name Mrs. Staplies, but she refused again and again, bearing her tormentors' nagging with Christian meekness and patience. She said she would not add to her condemnation by accusing another falsely; that even if Mrs. Staplies had wronged her in her testimony (probably a mistake), she would not render evil for evil; and at last burst into tears and asked her persecutor to pray for her, for never was any one so tempted as she had been—which did not soften the set narrow women around her by a shade. It is true, others swore that she wavered and incriminated Mrs. Staplies next day; but if true, that would only show that she was breaking down under the torture, with a horde of women warning her to "take heede that the Deuill perswaded her not to sow malicious seed to doe hurt when she was dead." And let us bear in mind that she too believed in witchcraft, and on the appeals to her conscience perhaps felt doubts if she were not doing wrong to hide anything she knew, as Mrs. Staplies might really be a witch.

At all events, unless Ludlow was a barefaced liar (which is a theory out of court), Mrs. Knapp had been beset and perplexed into telling him at the gallows (he having taken his own turn in harrying her on the way thither) that Mrs. Staplies was the one hinted at by Mrs. Bassett. He was on exceedingly bad terms with Mrs. Staplies; made a practice of accusing her of falsehood, and once told her to her face she "went on in a tract of lying." This could have been left as a matter of opinion; but shortly afterward Mr. and Mrs. Davenport of New Haven (the Rev. John) spread abroad a private conversation of Ludlow with them at their home (defending themselves by saying they had not been asked to keep it secret, which Ludlow denied), in which he told them of this confession of Mrs. Knapp, and said Mrs.

Staplies had laid herself under suspicion of being a witch by her skepticism of Mrs. Knapp being one. They professed to think the story mere malice on Mrs. Knapp's part (they did not know her), and accused Ludlow of trying to spread gossip; a rather impudent charge, as it was they and not he who circulated the gossip that might bring to the gallows the very woman they professed to be defending. They stated in excuse that Ludlow told them Mrs. Knapp had been overheard, and he was afraid others would spread it; but then they might not, and it was obvious Ludlow did not intend to. In fact, he said nothing worse than that she was a foolish woman for bringing suspicion on herself—in which her best friends might concur, though we respect her sense and outspokenness. She seems from the record to have been an inquisitive and long-tongued but good-hearted and rational woman, with a sense of humor her townswomen sadly lacked, and which helps to account for their acrid hostility to her. It is not safe to laugh at people who can hang you. But the danger was too great for quiescence; and her husband brought suit for defamation—not against the Davenports, who had circulated the defamation, but against Ludlow, who had kept the worst part of it quiet. The counts were three,—the statement of the confession, statements as to her incredulity of Goody Knappe being a witch, and calling her a liar.

Ludlow had for some weeks been preparing to leave America for good (he spent his last years in Holyhead, Wales), had his ship engaged, and must have received the process but a few days before he went; he therefore left funds with his attorney, Ensign Alexander Bryan of Milford (New Haven Colony), to satisfy any judgment, with directions to collect evidence and defend the case. Bryan collected an overwhelming mass to show that Ludlow only told matter of universal notoriety; then he went into court with it May 29—but curiously, this suit of one Connecticut citizen against another was not brought in the Fairfield court, but

before the New Haven general court, which had no jurisdiction over Fairfield and would not have been allowed to meddle of its own motion. The only explanation yet attempted is worse than worthless, being a false statement—that Ludlow was a “refugee” in New Haven. I can suggest but one explanation: that Ludlow, having expressly or virtually resigned his Connecticut citizenship, was a citizen of nowhere but England in general when the process was served; that there was therefore free choice of jurisdiction between the parties, and that the two agreed on New Haven as being fairer for the plaintiff than the Fairfield particular court, of which Ludlow had just left the judgeship, or the Hartford, Ludlow having been so prominent a magistrate. In a word, it was chosen as the basis of an umpire. That court, however, took the question to be not whether Ludlow told the truth, but whether Mrs. Staples had been brought into unfair danger; and on the latter ground fined Ludlow in absence £10 for defamation on the first two counts, besides £5 for costs of court, and the next term fined him another £10 for accusing her of lying, which was not related to the Davenport story.

Part of the testimony brought out, in addition to what has been stated, throws an interesting light on the public state of mind. It seems Mrs. Staples made an opportunity to strip and examine the old woman’s body after her execution, to look for the “witch-teats,” which were one pretext for such killings, and by which the Devil was supposed to suck his familiars. Having done so, she contemptuously told the others there were no teats other than she herself or any other woman had, and if those were witch-marks she was one herself; and that if the accusing gossips would search their persons they would find the same—a remark which greatly incensed her auditors. The highly feminine reply of one woman, that it made no difference,—she had teats anyway, and confessed she was a witch,—would be delicious if it were not so grim a specimen of the reasoning on which a human life could hang in those days.

This recital shows the gross unfairness of the charges brought against Ludlow in connection with the case. There is no evidence that he bore any part in fastening the charge on Mrs. Knapp; it was the crowd of female gossips around Goody Bassett who must have done that. Nor is there any that he was trying to punish Mrs. Staplies for skepticism over the case; his all-powerful word would have haled her to the same court and quite likely the same gallows as Goody Knapp, but he withheld it, and it was her alleged friends who came near doing her that service instead. We do not even know that his quarrel with her was related to the Knapp case. There is equally little basis for the assumption that the New Haven court was acting out of spite to Ludlow; he must have chosen or agreed to that court himself, and it distinctly stated that it refrained from severe judgment in his absence.

Five persons, and perhaps six, had lost their lives for witchcraft in six years at most, and it may be four of them close together. Possibly people began to have a revulsion of feeling at the deaths coming so quickly, and to scan the evidence more closely. At any rate, no further executions took place for nine years; then there was a frenzy of suspicion and several deaths, the last known in Connecticut. Meantime there are cases which show that common sense was not wholly dead, and whose grotesqueness we can freely enjoy.

In 1653, immediately after the Knapp-Staplies affairs, —and very likely as part of the same ferment,—an old woman named Elizabeth Godman, then living in the family of Deputy-Governor Stephen Goodyear of New Haven, was currently charged with being a witch. She was a peppery person with an active tongue, and aggressive in her self-defenses; the other women hated and dreaded her; she muttered a good deal to herself, and she was much too ready with rational explanations of the evil eye and other sorceries. Moreover, she told Rev. Mr. Hooke, teacher of

the church and afterward Cromwell's chaplain, that witches should be converted instead of provoked. That gentleman thereafter lent ear to the most extraordinary mass of rubbish concerning her actions, to which in due time he deposed in court. Finally the wife of the colonial treasurer, Joshua Atwater, was much disturbed at Mrs. Godman's supernatural scent for some figs in her pocket; and when a neighbor's girl, after watching her "cutt a sopp" at Mrs. Atwater's house, had chills and fever and laid it to Mrs. Godman's sorceries, the latter was forbidden the Atwater house. Mrs. Godman saw the bolt coming, and with admirable nerve summoned Mrs. Atwater, Hooke and his wife, the Goodyears, the wife of Bishop (the colonial secretary), and others, to answer for having hinted at her being a witch. The case was first heard May 21, 1653, but continued many weeks with hearings and depositions, new discoveries of her sorceries, and (more alarming still) her jeers at the witchcraft solution of all sorts of personal and social evils. She had suggested that Hooke's sick boy had done too much sliding, and accounted for the fits and stillbirths of a Goodyear bride (whose husband she was suspected of wanting herself, old as she was) by heredity. Two girls had "peeked" at her in bed and seen the Devil there, they were sure, but had been scared away by the old woman before they had a good look at him; and one of them had the ague some days after. Goody Thorpe had a chicken die and others "drope" after refusing to sell them to Mrs. Godman. Finally, on August 4, the court gave judgment that the defendants had a right to suspect her, and that she was reputed a great liar; that she must not go about to other houses "in a rayling manner," as heretofore, but "keepe her place and medle with her own business," otherwise she would come before them again and all this evidence would count. Unluckily, she did not heed this admonition, and two years later she was up again. She certainly had the art of making herself well

hated, and New Haven felt that it had too much of her. Mr. Goodyear had turned her out, the prayer-meeting had barred her out, and the neighbors had had deplorable experiences with their products and animals, all laid on her head. She was sent to prison in August, to be capitally tried in October; her health being bad, however, she was released with a warning in September. Then there was more unaccountable work of the Evil One, Mr. Hooke being the chief sufferer; it seems fortunate this person was in New Haven and not Connecticut, or Salem might have been outdone in the tale of slaughter. The court in October decided, however, that though she was "full of lying," and it was a pretty clear case so far as suspicion went, there was not evidence enough yet to put her to death, and she was let off with the old warning not to go about making enemies for herself. She gave £50 security for good behaviour, and disappears till her death in 1660.

Just before her second committal, on July 3, 1655, Nicholas Bayly and his wife were apprehended on suspicion, but were told that they would not be proceeded against just now; after several examinations they were advised to leave the colony on account of the wife's "lying malice and filthy speeches," she acting as if "possessed with the verrey Devill."

In 1657 New Haven had another equally plain case. This was a charge by Thomas Moulénor that William Meaker had bewitched his pigs, several of which had sickened and died; he discovered Meaker's agency by putting first the severed tail and ear of a sick pig into the fire, and then the remainder "till it was dead." Meaker brought suit for defamation; it is significant of the confidence felt in the justice and moderation of the magistrates, that in New Haven the accused took the aggressive. Moulénor was a "tough subject," drunken, quarrelsome, litigious, and insubordinate; he had been under £100 bonds for good behaviour the last twelve years, and the court called his attention to this

and informed him that the colony would be better off without than with him. He withdrew his charge.

In 1657-8 a case came to Connecticut from beyond its recent Long Island possessions—at Easthampton, where Lion Gardener lived. One of his servants accused another, Goodwife Garlicke, of killing her baby by sorcery; Gardener testified that the accuser had taken an Indian baby to nurse, and to gain the money had let her own baby starve. The magistrates, however, seem to have been rather proud of their first sorcery case, and felt it incumbent on them to treat demonology with more respect; and not being competent judges, deputed two men to take Mrs. Garlicke to “Keniticut,” deliver her up to the authorities for trial, and ask to have Easthampton annexed to Connecticut. The May term, 1658, acquitted her, and sent her back with a letter from Governor Winthrop to the town, admonishing them to treat Joseph Garlicke and his wife “neighbourly and peaceably,” if they expected like treatment from them. Nevertheless, by some abstruse reasoning, they made her husband pay the cost of her transportation and lodging.

From 1659 to 1663 Saybrook took its turn, but there is little to learn about the case. In the former year Samuel Wyllys and John Mason were deputed to go there and examine the “suspicions about witchery;” but no further record appears till September 5, 1661, when Nicholas and Margaret Jennings were indicted for “having caused the death of several.” This is much the worst indictment drawn against any Connecticut witches, and would naturally have given them short shrift; especially if (as pretty certain) they are the “Nicholas Gennings” and “Margaret Poore, alias Bedforde,” who were brought before the New Haven general court in 1643 as runaway servants, guilty of lewdness, theft, and other misdemeanors, and were sentenced to be whipped and married. But perhaps the very atrocity of the charge made the jury skeptical; anyway, on

October 9 it disagreed. The case would seem to have been sharply debated outside the record; for on March 11, 1663, the Connecticut general court disallowed the Saybrook constables' charges for witnesses in the case, and announced that they would pay no such charges in the future.

The cases of 1662 were Connecticut's nearest approach to the Salem cases of thirty years later, and originated in much the same fashion: here were two different and possibly unconnected cases of hysterical suggestion, but not falling on ground quite so well prepared, nor stimulated by such encouragements to falsehood, so that it did not approach the magnitude of that terrible devastation. Seven persons were indicted, of whom two were certainly executed and probably a third. The fire and tow respectively were nervous people fed upon tales of witchcraft and the knowledge of the executions for it at their own doors, and social pariahs a subject of mingled dislike and apprehension to their neighbors. It began with the eight-year-old girl of John Kelly, who in the delirium of sickness, in the spring of 1662, cried out against Mrs. William Ayres (whom she had of course been taught to shun) for afflicting her; she died, and an autopsy was held to see if her interior gave any token of illegitimate causes. Goody Ayres foreboded it as a death-warrant (which was made extra ground of suspicion), and, effecting her escape, fled with her husband, leaving behind a son, who was apprehended by the general court. It is probable that the water ordeal had previously been tried on them—tying hand and foot and throwing them in to swim; it certainly had on one couple. Increase Mather says that a bystander (who had the instincts of a man of science) asserted that floating was no proof, because anyone would float in that condition; and offered himself for an experiment, but sank when thrown in. In the flurry of suspicion, others were apprehended also; among them Judith, wife of Caspar Varleth and sister-in-law of Peter Stuyvesant, who wrote a letter in her

favor and probably secured her release, and one James Walkley, who fled to Rhode Island. On June 13, Mary, the wife of Andrew Sanford, was indicted after the usual formula, for having done acts and learned secrets beyond the ordinary course of nature by Satan's help. She was convicted, but nothing more is known of her.

The next step in the tragedy is very like the Salem performances also. Ann Cole was a religious melancholic, tormented with doubts about her religious welfare; and in 1662 began to take fits in which she maundered for some hours about a company of evil spirits taking counsel how to ruin her (with supernatural witlessness, in the hearing of their victim), and concluding to "confound her language that she may tell no more tales." They did it so clumsily that she merely talked in a Dutch brogue; she was not intimate with the only Dutch family there, and her hearers (she always had her fits before hearers) were convinced that only supernatural means could have given her so good a Dutch accent. The fits were contagious, and she and two other women had them in church several times, doubtless without consciousness that they were the most interesting objects there. A special day of prayer was held for them, and they rose to the occasion so vigorously that one of the company fainted at the sight; and Ann Cole denounced Elizabeth, wife of Richard Seager, as a witch. Mrs. Seager characterized it as "hodge-podge," as no doubt it was; but barely escaped with her life, being indicted three times,—January 6, 1662-3, July 2, 1663, (accused of witchcraft, adultery, and blasphemy, but convicted only of adultery), and July 16, 1665. The last time she was found guilty and lodged in prison, but after about a year was released (May 18, 1666), and removed to the Alsatia of the oppressed, Rhode Island. As the victims were unjustly accused, we praise the government which sheltered them; but as they were usually undesirable citizens of their old residence, the false charge hardly made them desirable acquisitions to the new one.

Among the other disesteemed citizens of Hartford at this time were Nathaniel Greensmith and his wife Rebecca, of whom he was the third husband. He was a well-to-do farmer, every now and then convicted of petty thievery, assault and battery, or lying. She is described by Rev. John Whiting as a "lewd, ignorant, and considerably aged woman," with two daughters by her first marriage. Almost every country town has such families (granting the accuracy of the details),—low-caste, of bad example, a thorn in the side of the respectable inhabitants, and of whom no one is quite sure what they will do some time. The interesting feature of the witchcraft cases is, that so often these parties have accumulated considerable property. Greensmith's estate inventoried about £182, equal in relative rank to fully \$5,000 now, and that in a country town. From his wife's "confession," one may suspect that there were local doubts of its being all honestly acquired. The Greensmiths lived next door to the Coles, the first lot on the present Wethersfield Avenue. As a result of these various excitements and suggestions, Rebecca was arrested and lodged in prison. She had probably the repute of a witch already, as her husband at that very time had an action pending against William Ayres for slandering her, most likely with charges of sorcery, perhaps to relieve his own wife. The result is one of those surprising things we frequently meet in these cases, and which justified the witch-hunters to themselves and every one else then, and makes it hard to blame them now. How should they doubt the truth when the accused themselves owned to it all, and more? Mrs. Greensmith not only confessed everything charged against her, but invented a luxuriant confession of all sorts of things derived from the stock witch-tales on which she had been fed; and every time a new person asked her questions, she had a fresh confession ready to oblige them. Why?—who can tell? Probably her weak old brain was full of delusions, and had given way under the strain. She said that she

had resolved at first to deny it all, but it was as though the flesh were pulled off her bones, and she must tell the truth. That the questioners asked if the Devil had had sexual intercourse with her, and she admitted that he frequently had, are matters of course. Perhaps Rev. Mr. Whiting's charge that she was "lewd" means only this, as the "considerably aged" wife of a prosperous third husband should have the presumption of decent conduct.

On December 30, 1662, the Hartford particular court indicted the couple for familiarity with Satan and its usual results. The husband refused to make a confession, but his wife reconfessed enough for both, her statement probably shot with threads of irrelevant but fatally confirmatory truth. On January 8, 1662-3, she fairly outdid herself. The first item of the confession was probably true: "My husband . . . told me that now thou hast confest against thyself, let me alone and say nothing of me and I will be good unto thy children." This reasonable request was thrown away; contrary to the kindly and honorable Goody Knapp, she accused everybody within reach, her husband first of all, and, mainly following the beaten track of local suspicions, Goodies Seager, Sanford, and Ayres, James Walkley, and Judith Varleth. These others were either out of reach or the court discredited the charge; but her husband and herself were found guilty and shortly executed. Ann Cole at once recovered, and ten years later married a widower with eight children (Andrew Benton), who a couple of years before had bought Greensmith's confiscated estate, where she spent the remainder of her days. Her nerves must have recovered to an enviable equipose, or it would seem she might have preferred some other residence; but sentiment was not morbidly insistent in those times, especially with a *passee* spinster who had an offer of marriage.

Two days before the last confession of Goody Greensmith, Mary Barnes of Farmington was indicted for witch-

craft and found guilty by the jury. What relation, if any, her case had to the Greensmith's, is not known, but probably it was part of the same outbreak. The only further note of her fate is a bill for "keep" in prison; and as this was for about the same length of time as the Greensmiths', she was probably executed like them.

Connecticut's debauch was over for many years. What produced the change, is matter of inference. Probably the very extent and fury of the craze, as with the Salem cases, showed the community the possible abyss under its feet, and bred secret doubts. Its close, too, is nicely coincident with the new charter, the absorption of New Haven, and the expansion of the horizon due to this great enlargement of political interests, with the overturn in New York. Nor is it altogether unlikely that the new spirit introduced by the restoration, the violent reaction against Puritanism in the old country, gave courage to the more liberal element in the new to hold up its heads. Something certainly strengthened the hands of the Connecticut magistrates.

In May, 1669, occurred the most remarkable case in the colony in one respect. One of the richest persons in Wethersfield was indicted for witchcraft: Catherine Harrison, widow of a former town surveyor and crier, who had died three years before worth by appraisal £610—equivalent certainly to fifteen or twenty thousand dollars now, and in a rural village. She had three daughters, the eldest sixteen. A jury of the court of assistants convicted her; she appealed to the general court, May term, 1670, which heard the case without a jury and acquitted her, but compelled her to pay the costs, and advised her to leave the town for her own safety and the neighbor's content. As the court knew the local circumstances, we may infer that it thought she had herself to thank for much of the trouble, in what way we cannot guess. She went to Westchester, N. Y., but its inhabitants attempted to send her back; after three years' harrying, however, an accusation before the new

Dutch governor (Colve) failed ignominiously, and she was thereafter left unmolested.

In 1683 the house of Nicholas Desborough in Hartford was pelted with stones and clods by invisible hands, and a fire set without much harm, till Desborough returned some goods belonging to a neighbor, when the supernatural manifestations ceased.

When the Salem craze spread over New England in 1692, one spot in Connecticut shared it deeply; that actual bloodshed was averted testifies to the general broadening which upheld the magistrates in not carrying out sentences. That spot was Fairfield, an instance of the persistent localization of feeling which shows that each community has its separate moral physiognomy. Perhaps it shows too that the feuds of forty years before were still smouldering; for we find our old friend Mrs. Staples, who must by this time have become an expert (there can hardly have been two witches of the name, unless she had trained a daughter-in-law in her own craft), among the accused and imprisoned. The Connecticut general court ordered a special court held in Fairfield, which assembled in September (14 or 19), composed of the leading men of the colony—including Governor Treat, Deputy-Governor William Jones (Eaton's son-in-law), and Secretary John Allyn—and a grand and petty jury. To be fully prepared with evidence, the townspeople had put two suspects, Mercy Disborough and Elizabeth Clawson, to the water ordeal; both "swam like a cork," we are required to believe, though the crowd tried to push at least Mrs. Disborough under. The two, with some two hundred witnesses, were examined. The jury disagreed, and the court met again on October 28 for final decision. More evidence was taken, including the examination of the prisoners' bodies for witch-marks by a committee of women. Their report is not quotable with decency: evidently none of the committee had grown old and flabby or would admit the fact if so; each should have been at least

seventy. The jury were required to find a verdict; they evidently attached no weight to the ordeal or the "witch-marks," for they found all but Mercy Disborough not guilty, and convicted her. They were sent out to reconsider the verdict, but repeated it. The governor, for the judges, then pronounced the death sentence; but (probably at the suggestion of the members of the court) a memorial to the general assembly for her pardon was drawn up. Although there is no record of formal action she was doubtless quietly released, as she (or her double) was alive fifteen years later.

An unexplained sporadic case occurred in Fairfield shortly after this. On November 15 one Hugh Crosher ("Crocia") was indicted for witchcraft; but on May 8, 1693, the grand jury threw it out, endorsing "Ignoramus" (we know nothing of it) on the bill.

One more indictment, in 1697, probably closes the list of Connecticut's witchcraft prosecutions, though it was not the last appearance of the crime for the court's cognizance. This was in Wallingford, where "Winnifrett Denham, Sr.," and the same Jr. (a girl of twelve or thirteen), were indicted for the old common-form acts, and for "misteriously hurting the Bodies and Goods of . . . Jno. Moss, Jr., Joseph Roys, and Ebenezer Clark, with divers others." They were searched for witch-teats, subjected to the water ordeal, and excommunicated by the ministers; what happened to them is uncertain, except that they saved their lives. Fowler's "History of Salem Witchcraft" (1765) says they were bound over to the superior court at Hartford, acquitted at the August term, 1697, again complained of, and fled to New York. Unfortunately, the superior court records from 1697 to 1701 are lost. Davis's "History of Wallingford and Meriden" says the grand jury endorsed on the bill "Ignoramus," but this may be a confusion with the case of Hugh Crosher.

From 1665 on, all the convictions had been virtually quashed by the court; it has been intimated that the court's

will to do so earlier was probably as good as that of the New Haven body. There is no further evidence of any active measures to suppress witchcraft in Connecticut, or I believe in New England: the so-called Age of Queen Anne, indeed, was already at hand in England, and its spirit probably felt even in New England, and it was not a spirit of zeal. But one more case brought the general merits of the witchcraft theory before the courts, as late as 1724. One Sarah Spencer had removed from East Haddam to Colchester, carrying with her the repute of a witch. She suffered so much annoyance from it that her minister, Rev. John Bulkley, gave her a certificate for "good religion and virtue." But on revisiting Haddam, one Elizabeth Ackley cried on Mrs. Spencer for "pinching and riding" her, and the husband, James Ackley, threatened her if she came that way again. Mrs. Spencer sued them for £500 damages in the county court, and received £5 with costs. The defendants appealed to the superior court, which gave the case to a jury, who awarded Mrs. Spencer one shilling damages, and said they found the defendants not insane—wherefor we may infer that they were a poor old half-crazy couple not thought capable of harming any one.

In other American colonies considering themselves entitled to throw stones at the Puritans, and liberally availing themselves of the privilege, the superstition as an active force survived much later than in New England: the water ordeal was practiced in Virginia in 1712. And what Hutchinson said late in the eighteenth century has never been contradicted, that "more have been put to death in a single county in England in a short space of time, than have suffered in all New England from the first settlement to this time." The chief distinction of New England from old England in this matter, in fact, is that its rural population were so soon, so far, and so universally emancipated from the sway of the superstition; that its own historians have so unflinchingly dragged the facts to light; and that the revolt of its sons

against the system of their ancestors has led them to welcome and themselves exaggerate every charge against the latter, to deny them the commonest justice of pleading, and to judge them by a standard imposed on no other people in history. Furthermore, the history of an English county is only ranked as local antiquities, sunk out of sight in the larger issues of English history; while the Puritan American commonwealths are independent entities, set on a hill for all to scrutinize their every detail of social action enveloped in a glare of light, and usually hostile light. If there are other American foundations seemingly freer from this particular delusion than New England, it will be found on examination that it was only on the surface; that the differences were not in beliefs, which were no more advanced or rational than those of the Puritans, but in the power of effective action under them; that while the New England commonwealths were relatively homogenous, in others there were different elements, neither of which had power to persecute the rest, nor was inclined to persecute itself in the presence of the others.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE KENTUCKY RESOLUTIONS OF 1798.

BY ETHELBERT D. WARFIELD, LL.D.

THERE are few documents of the earlier period of our national life which possess a greater interest than the series of resolutions adopted in Virginia and Kentucky in 1798-9. They were the first official party documents formulating the tenets of that school which was fast crystalizing into a party. At the time, they were but authorized expressions of the position the strict constructionist occupied, and had from a party standpoint no deeper significance. Every day similar expressions were passing current. The ideas were common to the whole of that great or fast increasing body which opposed the policy of the administration, and trembled before the self-conjured spectre of a monarchy. But as time slipped by they became the repository of the principles of the men who had laid the foundations, and the eyes of later builders were turned to them as containing the purest type of democracy. Hence it was that the matter of authorship, while by no means unnoted at the time, was yet of too little importance to be dwelt on, while to-day it is of only less import than the contents of the documents themselves.

Those who played the chief roles in the Virginia legislature on the occasions of the introduction of the resolutions of 1798, and of the subsequent confirmation of their doctrines, happily survived for many years and left no shadow of doubt upon them. Quite otherwise was it with those whose names have been connected with similar action in

Kentucky. George Nicholas, who by a strange contortion of critical acumen has long been the reputed mover of these resolutions, died in the year 1799. John Breckinridge, the actual mover and probable author, died in 1806, after a brief career in the senate and the cabinet, but before any question arose as to their authorship.

The present status of the case may be briefly explained. Almost all the recent works that treat of these resolutions directly or indirectly, attribute their authorship to Mr. Jefferson, and their introduction into the house of representatives of Kentucky to George Nicholas, the brother of Colonel Wilson Carey Nicholas and of John Nicholas, and a man very prominent in the state politics of the time. The basal fact of all this is the letter to be found in editions of Mr. Jefferson's works, as to "—— Nicholas, Esq." Upon it the whole tissue rests. Take it away and the fabric tumbles to the earth. Any reconstruction must, indeed, involve some of the essential facts in this. But the accepted view has taken color from this letter, and others commenting upon it, to such an extent that it has greatly extended the errors naturally to be drawn from it.

This letter is reprinted here in full, as it is the text of this discourse. The punctuation will be seen to differ slightly in the two published copies. That here used is as nearly as possible that of the manuscript, which it is rather difficult to reduce to any accepted system.

"Monticello, December 11, '21.

"DEAR SIR: Your letter of November 19 places me under a dilemma which I cannot solve but by an exposition of the naked truth. I would have wished this rather to have remained as hitherto without inquiry, but your inquiries have a right to be answered. I will do it as exactly as the great lapse of time and a waning memory will enable me. I may misremember indifferent circumstances, but can be right to substance. At the time when the Republicans of our country were so much alarmed at the proceedings of the Federal ascendancy in congress in the executive and the judiciary departments, it became a matter of serious consideration how head could be made against their enterprises on the constitution. The leading Republicans of congress found themselves of no use there, brow-beaten as they were by a

bold and overwhelming majority. They concluded to retire from that field, take a stand in their state legislature, and endeavor there to arrest their progress. The Alien and Sedition laws furnished the particular occasion. The sympathy between Virginia and Kentucky was more cordial and more intimately confidential than between any other two states of Republican policy. Mr. Madison came into the Virginia legislature. I was then in the vice-presidency and could not leave my station; but your father, Colonel W. C. Nicholas and myself, happening to be together, the engaging the co-operation of Kentucky in an energetic protestation against the constitutionality of those laws became a subject of consultation. Those gentlemen pressed me strongly to sketch resolutions for that purpose, your father undertaking to introduce them to that legislature, with a solemn assurance, which I strictly required, that it should not be known from what quarter they came. I drew and delivered them to him, and in keeping their original secret he fulfilled his pledge of honor. Some years after this Colonel Nicholas asked me if I would have any objection to it being known that I had drawn them. I pointedly enjoined that it should not. Whether he had unguardedly intimated before to anyone I know not, but I afterwards observed in the papers repeated imputations of them to me, on which, as has been my practice on all occasions of imputation, I have observed entire silence. The question, indeed, has never before been put to me, nor should I answer it to any other than yourself, seeing no good end to be proposed by it, and the desire of tranquility inducing with me a wish to be withdrawn from public notice. Your father's zeal and talents were too well known to desire any additional distinction from the penning these resolutions. That circumstance surely was of far less merit than the proposing and carrying them through the legislature of his state. The only fact in this statement on which my memory is not distinct, is the time and occasion of the consultation with your father and Mr. Nicholas. It took place here I know, but whether any other person was present or communicated with is my doubt. I think Mr. Madison was either with us or consulted, but my memory is uncertain as to minute details. I fear, dear sir, we are now in such another crisis, with this difference only, that the judiciary branch is alone and single-handed in the present assaults on the constitution; but its assaults are more sure and deadly, as from an agent seemingly passive and unassuming. May you and your contemporaries meet them with the same determination and effect as your father and his did the 'Alien and Sedition' laws, and preserve inviolate a constitution which, cherished in all its chastity and purity, will prove in the end a blessing to all the nations of the earth. With these prayers, accept those for your own happiness and prosperity.

"TH. JEFFERSON."

This letter is drawn in many respects with the skill and adroitness of a state paper, and yet the apology for his failing memory is proved to be not unnecessary by the ref-

erence to Mr. Madison in the Virginia legislature, and the antecedent statement that the republicans had retired from congress in order to take up a stand in the state legislatures. Mr. Madison's move was still in the unknown future, while the latter movement not only never occurred, but Mr. Jefferson and the rest of his coterie were full of joy at certain gains in the next congressional elections, as may be seen in their letters.

The link in the chain that connects George Nicholas with these resolutions are briefly these: The above letter, and a letter from Mr. Madison to "—— Townsend, (S. O.),"¹ which declares George Nicholas to be the father of the person to whom that letter was addressed, and *a fortiori* the mover of these resolutions. This latter letter was written under date of the eighteenth of October, 1831, after Mr. Madison had accomplished his four-score years, and was in answer to several questions in regard to the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions which were the theme of frequent discussion in connection with the attitude of South Carolina, and the well-known speech of Colonel Hayne. One of the questions touched upon the very point in question, and concerning it he says:

"Again, whether the father of the Mr. Nicholas referred to in the letter of December 11, 1821, as having introduced the resolutions of 1798 into the Kentucky legislature, be not the same individual to whom Mr. Jefferson alludes as the brother of Colonel Wilson Carey Nicholas, in a letter addressed to the latter on the fifth of September, 1799; vol. iii, p. 420. He was the elder brother, and his name George. He died prior to the Kentucky resolutions of 1799."

It appears from this letter that the correspondents had before them the published works of Mr. Jefferson (plainly the well-known edition of 1829), and Mr. Madison, in answering this letter, has too clearly made his only task the replying to the superficial question, accepting without con-

¹"Madison's Works," vol. iv, p. 198.

sideration that the letter was properly entitled to the caption it bore. Proceeding on the premises then at hand, the answer was simple enough. If the letter was addressed to a Nicholas, then it must have been to a son of George Nicholas, for Wilson Carey Nicholas was excluded by the references to him in the letter; and the third brother, John Nicholas, while active in the opposition to the Alien and Sedition laws, played his part elsewhere and was never connected with the affairs of Kentucky.

The whole matter, however, rests upon a fundamental error, and one which Mr. Madison could not have failed to detect, had he only addressed himself for a moment to recalling the occurrences of those memorable years, and the men they made and the reputations that sprang out of them.

The fact is, that the Jefferson letter was not written to any Nicholas whatever. It was addressed to the eldest son of John Breckinridge, sometime senator from Kentucky, and attorney-general in Mr. Jefferson's cabinet; this son, Joseph Cabell Breckinridge, being at that time a member of the Kentucky legislature. The original of this letter is still in existence among the papers of the Breckinridge family. It bears the superscription: "Free. Th. Jefferson," and the address: "J. Cabell Breckinridge, Frankfort, Ky.," and is postmarked Charlottesville. It is written upon a single sheet, the letter occupying two inner pages, while the address appears upon the outer or fourth page, which also bears evidence of the wax that once sealed it. How this letter came to be mislabeled as to "—— Nicholas, esq.," and to be printed thus in all of the editions of Mr. Jefferson's works, is, of course, only to be conjectured. It may have been done by the writer's own hand at some later date or even contemporaneously; and if this be so, in either case it would offer further evidence to the decadence of a memory, which he himself confessed even while he gave examples of its lapses. But it seems far more prob-

able that it was the addition to an unlabeled copy from the hand of an editor and was the result of an unhappy attempt at drawing a conclusion from internal evidence. This, coupled with a slight exercise of "historical imagination," would readily lead one to infer that George Nicholas, so well known in Kentucky politics, was the person spoken of as "your father," in such close connection with Colonel Wilson Carey Nicholas, the more so that the circle which held this tiny state secret was so small and evidently so intimate. That this is so is the merest hypothesis, but it is an hypothesis that is supported by all the facts at our command, and that solves the problem. Certainly the letter itself, in Mr. Jefferson's unmistakable hand, his superscription including his "frank" and the postmark, all upon a single sheet, and coming from the natural repository, is the *best* evidence in the fullest legal sense, and beyond all question incontrovertible.

But outside of and beyond this letter there is not the least question that George Nicholas had no part in the offering of these resolutions. He was not in the Kentucky house of representatives in the session of 1798-9, and there is no mention of his name for many years after the events that in anywise connects it with this affair; while, on the other hand, the evidence that attributes to John Breckinridge the whole activity in the chain of circumstances that led up to and culminated in the passage of these resolutions is voluminous and complete. Some selections from the mass of proof easily producible on this point will show how conclusive it is. The *Kentucky Gazette* for the week following the passage of these resolutions reports them *in extenso*, attributing them to John Breckinridge. Humphrey Marshall, his contemporary and immediate predecessor in the United States senate, says in his "History of Kentucky:"²

²"History of Kentucky," by Humphrey Marshall, vol. ii, p. 255.

"Mr. John Breckinridge, an influential member from Fayette, introduced into the house of representatives a concatenation of resolutions, with no little ostentation, on the subject of these proscribed laws."

He then proceeds to review them at length, referring again and again to the mover by name. Another contemporary, a man among the foremost in Kentucky politics—Caleb Wallace, Esq.,—writes to John Breckinridge at Frankfort, in the interval between this action by the house and the concurrence by the senate, as follows:

"Lexington, 13th Nov., '98.

"MY DEAR SIR: I am happy to find that the resolutions, which have been adopted by the house of representatives, meet with the warm approbation of the people. I am still anxious to hear that they have also been concurred in by the senate, which I hope has been the case. My health and some business will prevent my being in Frankfort before next week. . . . Your resolutions have given the palsy to the friends of the Federal administration in this quarter, which I believe will be their effect throughout this state, and I hope will have considerable effect in some of the other states, and check the high-toned nerves of the administration. I am, dear sir,

"Your friend and servant,

"CALEB WALLACE."

Surely the proof is complete. If it were necessary, a mass of like evidence could be adduced, and the whole series of histories of Kentucky quoted to the same point. This is certainly unnecessary, and the more so that much must needs be said to further establish their preliminary point in the course of the discussion of the remaining proposition. It may be accepted, then, that George Nicholas was brought into this question by a purely gratuitous assumption, that John Breckinridge was the mover of the resolutions, and consequently he is the person adverted to as "your father" in the letter of December 11, 1821.

The next step is to see what can be drawn from the facts clustering about the "consultation," both by way of adding clearness to the position assumed, and also as throwing light on the question of the draughting of the paper. Mr. Jefferson refers to this "consultation" between Mr. Breckinridge, Colonel Nicholas, and myself. Was there then any

known opportunity for such an interview? There are numerous letters from different parts of Virginia, written during a visit to that state in the interval between the passage of the Alien and Sedition laws, and the assembling of the Kentucky legislature in the early winter. The letters that are attainable are family letters, and nothing was said in any of them of such an interview. This is not remarkable, for the letters as far as known are all of such a character that any such reference would have been stranger than the absence of it; and again, there is a current that runs through all the correspondence of the republican leaders of this period of distrust of the post-office and dislike to put any of their plans to the risk of being discovered before the proper time. If we may rely on Mr. Jefferson's letter on this very subject, it is easy to detect such a tendency. These letters, then, do not relate any facts in regard to such an interview, but they show that their writer was in that part of Virginia. The life-long intimacy between the statesmen is sufficient to base a very strong probability on, that they must have seen each other during this trip. This is but another link in the chain—circumstantial, indeed, but in due course, and corroborative of the facts known. Having, then, this "consultation" as the probable birth-movement of the document, the question presents itself, What was the position of the parties at the time? The whole country was excited in more or less degree by the struggle over the Alien and Sedition laws. The great head of the opposition was undoubtedly aroused to the sense of need of extraordinary resistance. Mr. Breckinridge was the representative of Kentucky, and as such he came prepared with a numerous series of resolutions passed by local meetings, and full of the fierce spirit of resistance which had been Kentucky's constant attendant from her earliest days. A page of her history interjected here may be of some weight on the side of the far greater likelihood that from Mr. Breckinridge emanated the framework of the document than from Mr. Jefferson.

For some time Kentucky had been in a state of ferment. The bonds that bound her to Virginia first galled her. The prospect that, if she held fast to the new-born nation, she would be cut off from the cherished Mississippi trade, woke in her a doubt, which grew to organized negotiation with Spain—a negotiation entered into by many of her principal citizens, among whom was George Nicholas. Once within the union, good faith practically stilled this faction. But she threw herself with no reserve into the arms of the anti-federalists, and watched with jealous eye the every act of the administration. As a part of this programme she was loud in her protestation of French inclinations. The scandalous conduct of Genet stayed for a moment the tide, and borne on a reflux wave Humphrey Marshall, the cousin and brother-in-law of the chief-justice, was sent to the senate as a federalist. But the Alien and Sedition laws broke down every barrier. Says Humphrey Marshall:³

"In August the country was greatly agitated in consequence of the passage of the Alien and Sedition laws by congress.

"Many meetings of the people were held in different parts of the state, on this occasion; and probably they were never more unanimous than in the condemnation of those laws—never failing to express great attachment to the constitution of the United States (the formula being in that wise) and almost as uniformly deprecating a war with France, and expressing their abhorrence of an alliance, offensive and defensive, with the rotten or the tottering monarchy of Great Britain, while in reality no idea of the latter was indicated by the government or its friends."

Toasts were drunk at every important dinner, condemning the obnoxious laws, lauding the leaders of the opposition, reasserting devotion to France, and fondly regarding the cherished Mississippi trade. The peculiar machinery of local government which she possessed in common with Virginia was set in motion. Mass meetings were held in every county town on the county court day, and vigorous resolutions were passed. Each one was but a reflection of

³"History of Kentucky," vol. ii, p. 251.

every other. The same sentiments were expressed in nearly the same form. The first of these came from the influential county of Clarke so early as the twenty-fourth day of July. The resolutions offered were passed with a single dissenting voice, and are appended as an example of the whole:

"First. Resolved, That every officer of the federal government, whether legislative, executive, or judicial, is the servant of the people and is amenable and accountable to them. That being so, it becomes the people to watch over their conduct with vigilance, and to censure and remove them as they may judge expedient. That the more elevated the office and the more important the duties connected with it may be, the more important is a scrutiny and examination into the conduct of the officer. And that to repose a blind and implicit reliance in the conduct of any such officer or servant is doing injustice to ourselves.

"Second. Resolved, That war with France is impolitic and must be ruinous to America in her present situation.

"Third. Resolved, That we will at the hazard of our lives and fortunes, support the union, the independence, the constitution, and the liberty of the United States.

"Fourth. Resolved, That an alliance with Great Britain would be dangerous and impolitic; that should defensive exertions be found necessary, we would rather support the burthen of them alone than embark our interests and happiness with that corrupt and tottering monarchy.

"Fifth. Resolved, That the powers given to the president to raise armies, when he may judge necessary—without restriction as to number,—and to borrow money to support them, without limitation as to the sum to be borrowed or the quantum of interest to be given on the loan, are dangerous and unconstitutional.

"Sixth. Resolved, That the Alien bill is unconstitutional, impolitic, unjust, and disgraceful to the American character.

"Seventh. Resolved, That the privilege of printing and publishing our sentiments on all public questions is inestimable, and that it is unequivocally acknowledged and secured to us by the constitution of the United States; that all the laws made to impair or destroy it are void, and that we will exercise and assert our just right in opposition to any law that may be passed to deprive us of it.

"Eighth. Resolved, That the bill which is said to be now before congress, defining the crime of treason and sedition and prescribing the punishments therefor, as it has been presented to the public, is the most abominable that was ever attempted to be imposed upon a nation of free men.

"Ninth. Resolved, That there is a sufficient reason to believe, and we do believe, that our liberties are in danger; and we pledge ourselves to each other and to our country that we will defend them against all unconstitutional attacks that may be made upon them.

"Tenth. Resolved, That the foregoing resolutions be transmitted to our representative in congress, by the chairman, certified by the secretary, and that he be requested to present them to each branch of the legislature and to the president, and that they also be published in the *Kentucky Gazette*.

"JACOB FISHBACK, Ch."

"Attest: R. HIGGINS, Sec."⁴

In a few days, Lexington, the county-seat of Fayette, the home both of George Nicholas and John Breckinridge, followed with a very similar set of resolves, and the one voice that was raised against the Clarke County action appeared in a letter over the signature of "Philo Agis," in which he said: "My plan is this: Let the legislature of Kentucky be immediately convened by the governor; let them pass resolutions praying for a repeal of every obnoxious and unconstitutional act of congress."⁵ Then George Nicholas, ever ready to run a joust in the cause of agitation, came forward in a document with the caption, "The Political Creed of George Nicholas." This fairly bristled with righteous indignation, pointed invective, and readiness to resist. This he followed up by a widely printed letter "to a friend in Virginia," dealing with the same matters.

These are but a few of the numberless examples of opposition, running the whole scale from mild remonstrance to extravagant bravado, which these laws awoke. In them are the germs of all that the future resolutions contained and the demand for such action on the part of the state. It was armed with such documents as these, pervaded with the spirit therein expressed, that he who finally introduced the resolutions went to the council, whence they are supposed to have issued.

But leaving for the present this line of research, note the contemporaneous expressions. Here Mr. Jefferson's statement, that silence was of his special injunction, must have its due weight. Here, too, must be placed his statement in

⁴From (Lexington) *Kentucky Gazette*, August 1, 1798.

⁵From (Lexington) *Kentucky Gazette*, August 22, 1798.

the well-known letter to Colonel W. C. Nicholas of the fifth of September, 1799,⁶ wherein he urges the necessity for such resolutions as Mr. Breckinridge drew and offered in the legislature of that year. He says: "As to the preparing anything, I must decline it to avoid suspicions (which were pretty strong in some quarters on the late occasion)." Exactly how much is to be drawn from this expression it is impossible to say; it will be largely determined by the personal feelings of the reader. But it seems to be capable of being thought a complete confession or a denial of any part, according as the suspicion was true or false. On the other hand, Mr. Breckinridge's family have always bitterly resented any attempt to question his right to the entire credit both of conception and execution. They have always pointed with confidence to the fact that it was a daily theme of conversation, a thing treasured, an heirloom of great price. Not until some rumor had awakened his son, and he had inquired of Mr. Jefferson and received the much quoted letter, was there any question of his being alone in the matter. That letter has been bitterly attacked. One of his sons characterized it as an attempt to rob his dead friend of his laurels, and again said: "Mr. Jefferson considered it too great an addition to his fame to be reputed their author ever openly to deny it."

The secret must indeed have been well and closely guarded. Mrs. Breckinridge, who survived her husband more than half a century, was of the strongest conviction of his singleness in this matter, and Humphrey Marshall in his "History" speaks again of Mr. Breckinridge as "the author and advocate of the resolutions on the subject of the Alien and Sedition laws." No one can read his severe strictures on Mr. Breckinridge and doubt that he believed him to be both their author and mover. Moreover, his opportunities of knowledge were the very best, and he had

⁶"Jefferson's Works," vol. ix., p. 305 (Ed. 1853).

good reason to use his invective against the head rather than against a subordinate leader of the party whose principles he detested; and this not only at the time of action, but afterward in the hour of retrospection. Not only was this so, but there were family ties that bound him to Mr. Breckinridge and dictated as lenient a policy toward him as possible. The relationship was not, indeed, close, but it was rendered far more intimate by the peculiar strength of all bonds of relationship under the Virginia system, and the vigor of these ties was nowhere more clearly recognized than in the clanship which has ever prevailed among both the Marshalls and the Breckinridges. Could he, therefore, either as the leader of the federalists in Kentucky or as the historian of that state, have found an opportunity to pass Mr. Breckinridge by and assail Mr. Jefferson, there is small room for doubt but he would have eagerly embraced it.

Certain letters might be quoted to show that the authorship and advocacy were regarded as resting together, not, indeed, by direct statements to that effect, but by plain implication. It must be remembered that the fact was not called in question for many years, and hence it is a little to be wondered at that no one rose to declare, "I know and do fully believe that John Breckinridge was the sole author of these resolves." A single quotation may, however, be made in passing, as an illustration of the kind of evidence these letters offer. This is taken from a letter written by the famous—or infamous, if you will—Matthew Lyon, sometime member and chief agitator of congress from Vermont, but at the time of the passage of these resolutions, member-elect from Kentucky, and later a staunch supporter of Mr. Jefferson in the contest with Burr. This letter was written March 2, 1802, when Mr. Breckinridge was in the senate, and in course of some remarks in praise of his successful assault upon the judiciary bill, Mr. Lyon says of his speeches:

"They were worthy of you, who had hitherto distinguished yourself far above every other orator and *writer* in the Kentucky resolutions respecting the Alien and Sedition laws."⁷

In the teeth of all this we have Mr. Jefferson's direct claim in the letter to J. Cabell Breckinridge, and what is, perhaps, of equal value to many (especially to those who remember the many little slips and lapses of memory, or assumptions by virtue of his party headship, which can be traced to Mr. Jefferson), Mr. Madison's statements when nullification stalked abroad that that word was not to be found in any draft of the resolutions that came from the pen of Mr. Jefferson, but only in those of '99. Both incl. were very old, and that Mr. Madison's memory was none of the best is evinced by the sudden awakening he experienced when he happened upon a copy of what is edited as Mr. Jefferson's original draft and which has "nullification," at least verbally, writ large upon it. This he says was by some strange accident sent him as a copy of the Kentucky resolutions of 1799. He writes to M. P. Trist, September 30, 1830,⁸ explaining this at length. This letter, together with two others, the one to J. C. Cabell on May 31, 1830,⁹ and the other to Edward Everett on August 20, 1830,¹⁰ afford the strongest evidence that Mr. Madison thoroughly believed that Mr. Jefferson was the original draftsman. In the letter to Mr. Everett he makes this very strong statement of Mr. Jefferson:

"It is certain that he penned the resolutions of '98, and probably in the terms in which they passed."

How far Mr. Madison was let into the inner courts on the occasion of this consultation is uncertain. No letter gives a clue to the maze, and it is yet very likely from all

⁷M. Lyon to J. Breckinridge, MS. Breckinridge papers.

⁸"Madison's Works," vol. iv, p. 204.

⁹Ib., p. 85.

¹⁰Ib., pp. 106, 109.

the known facts that Mr. Madison was not consulted, at the time or very near it, in person. Some further light may yet be won from the paper itself.

Upon a consideration of the resolutions themselves, they fall into two parts. The first part consists of the first eight resolutions, in which each is pointed, briefly expressed, and without unnecessary declamation or verbiage. The last resolution thus stands apart, strongly distinguished from its fellows by a large-voiced declamation, a certain application to everything and to nothing. This is very unlike the manner and matter of the preceding resolutions, and indicates a new hand, or a strange transformation in the draftsman. The diction and the sentiments, while having somewhat in common with, yet present a marked contrast to, the preceding matter—a contrast which is heightened rather than diminished by the striking similarity of a sentence or expression to be found isolated in the midst of the plain matter of the first part. Comparing them with the draft found among the papers of Mr. Jefferson and edited as the probable original, we notice a substantial agreement except in resolutions eight and nine. These are transposed. Eight, the representative of nine, is of a similar phraseology and very generally like the corresponding one in the final draft. It is, however, even more declamatory if possible, and has certain repetitions of several catch phrases, so after Mr. Jefferson's method that it is scarcely possible that anyone could fail to detect his hand. This, so plain here, is sufficient to convince anyone at all familiar with his style that Jefferson drew the resolution that concludes the set as adopted. This is so patent that it seems eminently probable that it was the moving cause of that "suspicion" which he alludes to in the letter to Colonel W. C. Nicholas. If it did not awaken suspicion it is passing strange.

One of the omissions, if they may be treated as such, of the Kentucky resolutions, as passed, is the word "nullification." This perhaps is a little strange both from Mr.

Madison's desire to show that his great preceptor had never used the word, and his fright on finding this draft, to think that he had to believe it of him; but even more from the fact that the resolutions of 1799 contain the dreadful term, and Mr. Breckinridge seems to have used it without qualms. It is, however, perhaps a little more than probable that Mr. Madison was the victim of an anachronism when he tried to relieve Jeffersonian democracy of the reproach of South Carolinian nullification. The tendency, if any is fairly to be drawn out of the changes in this resolution, is toward a simplification and an ordering of the contents. This is marked here and there in a relief from the cumbrousness of the cumulative style. All this points to a combination with Mr. Jefferson of just such an accurate, trained, legal mind as Mr. Breckinridge's. The mature work which he did upon the Kentucky constitution (which was more the work of his hand than of any other man's) gives evidence of his methods such as affords an instructive study, beside the very different hand in this document.

Again, there is a question as to the proper means of taking the steps which it is claimed the state may take. This question was an open one at the time. Mr. Madison writes¹¹ to Mr. Jefferson under date December 29, 1798, as follows:

"I have not seen the result of the discussions at Richmond of the Alien and Sedition laws. It is to be feared that zeal may forget some considerations which ought to temper their proceedings. Have you ever considered thoroughly the distinction between the power of the state and that of the legislature on questions relating to the federal pact? On the supposition that the former is clearly the ultimate judge of infractions, it does not follow that the latter is the legitimate organ, especially as the convention was the organ by which the compact was made. This was a reason of great weight for using general expressions that would leave to other states a choice of all the modes possible of concurring in the substance, and would shield the general assembly against the charge of usurpation in the very act of protesting against the usurpation of congress."

Now it is undoubted that Mr. Breckinridge had no ques-

¹¹Madison's Works, vol. ii, p. 149.

tion as to the sufficiency of the ordinary machinery of the state to meet this extraordinary end, and in consequence, there is some likelihood that he alone is responsible for the declaration to that effect, lacking as it does any parallel to the drafts of the other statesmen. And upon this point depends the only rational solution of the change in order of the eighth and ninth resolutions. In the draft found among Mr. Jefferson's papers it is a mere directory clause added to the paper, simply to give directions as to the steps to be taken in asserting and making known the principles set forth in the foregoing resolutions. As we have seen, there was a question as to the proper method of acting, and, also, that Mr. Breckinridge was strongly inclined to support the right of the state to act through its ordinary instruments, while Mr. Madison in the above quoted letter to Mr. Jefferson, presses the necessity of an extraordinary instrument. If (and in an innovation such things come to be so regarded) Mr. Breckinridge regarded the necessity of acting by the ordinary officers of the state as a matter of principle and not as a mere form, it was eminently natural that he should move the resolution expressing this idea up into the body of the paper and place the peroration (and the ninth resolution is certainly of this nature) last. This would be the only logical course. From this point of view, the transposition ceases to be the mere arbitrary measure it has always been considered, and shows the hand of one asserting himself as the person responsible for the sentiments and acting both freely and logically upon the paper as first drawn.

It is well to hold fast to the fact that there has never been found among Mr. Jefferson's manuscripts a copy of the resolutions as passed, and that this is significant in the face of his well-known habit of preserving all his papers, all must admit; that, moreover, the paper he sent to Mr. Madison was sent before he could have heard from Kentucky of their passage, though after their actual passage; that

the draft he sent differed from the actual set, not only in the points already noted but in others more or less significant. Hence it is plain that if he was concerned in the drafting, Mr. Breckinridge was independent, and the one really responsible for the principles presented to the legislature.

If a little of that historical imagination which has already been freely used on this problem be brought to bear just here, it may be possible to produce a solution out of the tangle that will be at least quite as probable as any hitherto set forth. Taking the testimony of Marshall and Lyon and Caleb Wallace as directly to the fact of the right of Mr. Breckinridge to all credit; taking the stir in Kentucky, the substantial demand for such action, and the similiarity in general tenor of the informal resolutions passed at various times—the “consultation,” the reiterated claim of the Breckinridge family, the age of Mr. Jefferson at the time of writing the Cabell Breckinridge letter,—as all pointing to the same conclusion; adding to that such measure of proof as may be drawn from the internal criticism of the document itself and from a comparison with the other draft, and of the sentiments of the persons concerned as to matters treated of, and you have the ground whereon the attempted explanation rests. It is as follows: Mr. Breckinridge discussed the matter with Mr. Jefferson in the “consultation,” making the local Kentucky resolutions his basis. Drafts were drawn in course, the quasi-original draft being one of them. Mr. Jefferson drew in the main the ninth resolution, and Mr. Breckinridge, to the same extent, the others. The latter also, feeling that the matter was in his own hands, freely altered where he thought best, and from him alone the final draft emanated. While, then, the resolutions were, indeed, joint work, it would be a fair claim that the whole credit belonged to the latter; yet the former, from his conscious place of headship and often-exercised right of considering himself the fountain-head of “republicanism,” might

with good faith have claimed, nearly a quarter of a century afterward, substantial authorship.

It was quite early in his career, and before he had attained to the complete headship of a party, that Mr. Jefferson, in compliance with a request of Mr. Madison to see what could be done through the Maryland representatives in the old federal congress as to the Potomac business, talked the matter over with Mr. Stone and wrote to Mr. Madison:

"Finding him of the same opinion, (I) have told him I would, by letters, bring the subject forward on our part. *They will consider it, therefore, as originated from this conversation.*"

Pray, why should "they" not have considered it as originated from Mr. Madison's letter? It is seemingly very plain that it sprang from no other source. Be that as it may, it has a tendency at least to weaken some of the weight to be given to any general claims of authorship, origin, etc., on the part of this great *Deus ex machina*.

The one point is settled beyond a peradventure—John Breckinridge was the *mover* of these famous resolutions, his foundation-stone of strict construction. The other point—of *authorship*,—it is to be feared, will long remain unsettled—probably always. Mr. Jefferson has preëmpted the claim in the domain of history, and will yield hardly to any attempt at an ouster. In Kentucky, at least, the memory of her son and his life-long services will long keep green, and his completest meed of praise will be awarded him with wide hand, in this as in all else.

NOTE.—The letter of J. Cabell Breckinridge to Mr. Jefferson, to which the letter of December 11, 1821, above quoted, is the answer, is of sufficient interest and importance to be appended to this sketch. It is given from a contemporary copy from the letter-book of Mr. Breckinridge, now among the Breckinridge papers. It is as follows:

"Frankfort, Nov. 19, 1821.

"DEAR SIR: If I had not experienced the effects of your candor and obliging indulgence on a former occasion, and on a subject connected with

the memory of my father, I should feel an insuperable reluctance to trouble you with this letter. A very brief narrative will explain its object.

"In the Richmond *Enquirer* of September 4, in an editorial stricture on certain articles that had appeared in the *National Intelligencer*, the writer, in support of his principles, refers to the authority of your name and opinions, and expresses himself in the following words: 'We protested against the "putting Mr. J. forward as the chief of a new party," and that the doctrines we held on the great question of supremacy in cases of collusion between the governments, was the doctrine of the old Republican party, of Mr. Madison's report of '98, and of the Kentucky resolutions penned by Mr. Jefferson himself.' Well knowing that the resolutions here alluded to were introduced into the legislature of Kentucky by my father as his own production, I was greatly astonished by the assertion of the editor. Convinced as I am that the mover of the resolutions would not have consented thus to appropriate the labor even of his illustrious friend, I did believe the assertion to be untrue.

"To a man the measure of whose fame and usefulness is full, an occurrence like the present may be regarded with indifference. But when you remember that the providence of God arrested at an early period the auspicious career of him whose loss I have cause so deeply to deplore, you will excuse, nay, approve the sensibility which I feel on every subject connected with his just (fame). If I am not deceived in the temper of the times, the day is at hand when the struggle of '98 is to be renewed with decisive characteristics of consolidating intent, and these states are to maintain a second contest for the purity and extent of their ancient rights. At such a crisis, involving the safety and perpetuity of some of the most sacred principles of American freedom, the recollection of similar events—the corresponding sentiments and acts of departed patriots—will be reviewed with peculiar interest and powerful effect, and I can distinctly perceive the value of your written declaration to insure justice to the memory of one, whom loving, you largely contributed to exalt. Believing that I cannot give a better evidence of the sincerity and respect of the present application than by omitting all formal and affected apologies for having made it, I hasten to assure you of my high consideration, and to offer you my sincerest wishes for your continued health and happiness.

"J. CABELL BRECKINRIDGE."

THE MORRIS FAMILY OF MORRISANIA.

BY W. W. SPOONER.

(Continued from p. 142.)

RICHARD MORRIS, third son of Hon. Lewis and Catherine (Staats) Morris, was born at Morrisania, August 15, 1730. He was appointed judge of the high court of admiralty, an office which had previously been held by his father, retaining this position under the crown until 1776, when he resigned, for the reason that his political principles would not permit him to continue in it. On July 31 of the same year he was unanimously appointed by the New York state convention as judge of the admiralty court under the provisional government then existing; and on the 22d of October, 1779, was elevated to the chief-justiceship of the state of New York, succeeding John Jay, and being the second to act in that distinguished capacity, in which he served until 1790. He was one of the nine delegates elected from New York County in 1788 to the famous Poughkeepsie convention which was called for consideration of the federal constitution, to whose ratification, under very difficult circumstances, he contributed by his abilities and influence.

Judge Morris owned estates in Westchester County at Mt. Fordham and in the present town of Scarsdale. His fine country-seat of "Mt. Fordham" was burned by the British during the Revolution.

Died at Scarsdale, April 11, 1810.

Married, June 13, 1759, Sarah Ludlow, daughter of Henry Ludlow.

Issue:

Lewis Richard Morris. M., 1st, 1786, Mary Dwight, daughter of Major Timothy and Mary (Edwards) Dwight. One child, Louisa Maria Morris, who m., 1st, Colonel John Starke Edwards; 2d, Major Robert Montgomery.—Lewis Richard Morris m., 2d, Theodora Olcott; 3d, 1801, Ellen Hunt.

Robert Morris of Fordham; of whom below.

Mary Morris. M. Major William Popham. She inherited her father's Scarsdale property. Her descendants are very numerous, a number of them having been prominent in Westchester County.

Two other daughters, who d. in infancy.

GOUVERNEUR MORRIS, son of Hon. Lewis and Sarah (Gouverneur) Morris, was born at Morrisania, January 30, 1752. Losing his father when only twelve years old, his education was cared for by his mother, and at a very early age he gave indication of brilliant abilities. His preparatory training was received under private tutors, and included careful instruction in the French language, in which he subsequently became highly proficient. He was graduated from King's College (now Columbia) in 1768, entered upon the study of the law in the office of William Smith the historian (later royal chief-justice of New York), and in 1771, before completing his twentieth year, was admitted to the bar.

In the course of events which culminated in the Revolution, Gouverneur Morris did not become an active participant until the occurrences of the early part of 1775 led to energetic preparations for resistance. He was not a member of the first provincial convention of New York, held in April of that year, in which his elder brother Lewis sat. The day after the adjournment of that convention news of the battle of Lexington was received in New York, and steps were immediately taken for summoning a provincial congress. To that body he was elected a delegate from Westchester County, and in its proceedings, which began on the 22d of May, he was one of the foremost leaders. He served as one of a committee of five to draft a plan for the settle-

ment of all difficulties with the mother country, and was the author of the resulting report. His most important service at this period, however, was the formulating of proposals for a continental currency, which, being unanimously approved by the provincial congress, were forwarded to the continental congress and there adopted without alteration. From youth he had been an acute student of financial questions, having at the age of eighteen published a series of papers on the provincial currency which attracted general attention for the soundness of their views.

Continuing as a member of the New York provincial congress, he was untiring in his devotion to the public interests, and, realizing the impossibility of retrogression from the measures taken, became an advocate of independence as the only practicable course. In this he was in advance of some of the influential statesmen of New York, with whose conservative principles and hopes of reconciliation he had indeed fully coincided, cherishing a pronounced repugnance to everything resembling disorder and mob government. But he regarded it as a prime obligation of intelligent citizens to be receptive to the logic of accomplished facts, if of a patriotic and virtuous tendency; and during the last session of the provincial congress, held in New York in June, 1776, he was a supporter of the programme of independence, as was his brother Lewis in the continental congress at Philadelphia.

He was a delegate to the "convention of representatives of the state of New York" that assembled at White Plains on the 9th of July, 1776, and promulgated the Declaration of Independence to the people of the state; and was appointed (August 1) a member of the committee, headed by John Jay, which was charged with the drafting of a state constitution. Throughout the duration of the convention, which coincided with the British invasion of his native county and the critical events of the winter of 1777, he was conspicuously identified with its very grave and responsible

transactions; and in the debates upon the adoption of the state constitution and organization of the state government in March and April, 1777, he took a leading part. Especially memorable is his active championship at this time of a constitutional clause providing for the gradual abolition of slavery, which was voted down as a too radical measure.

Though elected a member of the continental congress to succeed his brother, he deemed it his duty, in the serious condition of affairs in New York, to continue his services under the state government, and it was several months before he took his seat in the higher body. Presenting his credentials to the continental congress late in 1777, he was on the same day honored by appointment on a committee of five to confer with Washington regarding the reorganization, clothing, and provisioning of the army, and sanitary regulations; and during the winter spent much time at Valley Forge in the discharge of this important duty. In the records of the sessions of 1778 his name appears with great prominence. He was the author of the first instructions to an American minister abroad, which were sent to Franklin at Versailles; and upon the receipt of the conciliatory proposals of Lord North was made chairman of the committee designated to consider them, and drafted the famous reply, wherein all terms of peace not primarily based on withdrawal of the British military and naval forces and recognition of the independence of the United States were decisively rejected.

Owing to political dissensions in New York, Morris failed of reelection to the continental congress, and for some time subsequently was in retirement from public life, residing in Philadelphia, as the continued British occupation of New York prevented his return to his mother's home at Morrisania. During this period he practiced his profession, while in a private capacity still exercising an intelligent and valuable influence upon affairs. In the early part of 1780 he published in the *Pennsylvania Packet* an important

series of articles on the revolutionary finances. It was in May of the same year that the distressing accident occurred which, producing a fracture of the bones of one of his legs, necessitated its amputation at the knee.

From February, 1781, until the close of the war, he served as assistant to Robert Morris, the celebrated superintendent of finance. He was concerned in all the measures of the times adopted for promoting the credit of the country and introducing a stable financial system; and some of the principal of these originated with him. He drew up the plan of the Bank of North America, which was established on a capital of \$400,000 and incorporated by congress; and he was the author of the letter sent to congress by Robert Morris in 1782 proposing a scheme of American coinage, upon which the present system is based.

Retiring from the finance department at the time of the resignation of Robert Morris in 1783, he became associated with him in various trade enterprises, including commerce with the West Indies and tobacco shipments to France. He still maintained his residence in Philadelphia, and even after the death of his mother (1786) did not definitely return to live at Morrisania. Ultimately, however, he acquired by purchase from his brother in England, General Staats Long Morris, all of the ancestral lands lying east of Mill Brook, known as "Old Morrisania;" and here the last eighteen years of his life were spent.

In 1787 he was a delegate from Pennsylvania to the federal constitutional convention, sustaining there his high reputation for eloquence and ability, and supporting most of the policies advocated by Hamilton and the conservative element. The final draft of the constitution was placed in his hands for literary revision. Says Madison: "The finish given to the style and arrangement of the constitution fairly belongs to the pen of Mr. Morris. . . . The talents and taste of the author were stamped on the face of it."

His private commercial interests requiring his presence in

France, he sailed for that country in December, 1788. He was in Paris throughout the first eight months of the historic year 1789, and was a witness of the entire immediate succession of events which ushered in the French Revolution—the assembling of the states-general, the rising of the people, and the storming of the Bastille. Visiting London, he was concerned there in confidential diplomatic transactions with the British government. In 1792 he was nominated by President Washington and confirmed by the senate as minister plenipotentiary to France, an office which he retained until relieved in August, 1794; his service comprehending the period of the Reign of Terror and the culminating events of the Revolution—the executions of the king and queen and the fall of Robespierre. His stay in Europe was prolonged until the latter part of 1798, and included travels in the principal countries and continuous association with the most noted characters of the age.

Returning to America in January, 1799, after an absence of ten years, he resumed residence on his estate of Old Morrisania, his boyhood home, rebuilt the mansion, and improved the property with great taste. Various important and valuable activities, becoming his distinguished position as a citizen, marked his closing years. He delivered the oration before the Corporation of the City of New York on the death of Washington (1800), and the formal eulogy on Alexander Hamilton (1804). From May, 1800, to March, 1803, he represented New York in the United States senate. In 1807 he was at the head of the commission appointed to lay out New York City above its then existing bounds—a trust which was perhaps as singular a tribute of public confidence as any reposed in him during his career. To his far-seeing mind is attributed the first practical conception of the Erie Canal. "After a journey down the St. Lawrence through Lake Ontario and by land to Lake Erie, he wrote in 1801 to John Parish that a large commerce would at no distant period whiten those inland seas, and that one-tenth

of the cost to Britain of the last campaign would have enabled ships to sail from London through the Hudson River to Lake Erie." He was chairman of the Erie Canal commissioners from 1810 until his death. His last public appearance was on the occasion of his inaugural address as president of the New York Historical Society (August 16, 1816).

Died at Morrisania, November 6, 1816.

With the progress of time appreciation of the patriotic services and shining intellect of Gouverneur Morris has steadily grown among all reflective students of American history, and especially those of critical penetration. Equally for character and natural gifts, attainments and cultivation, and the advantages of manners and presence, he was the peer of any American of his times; and "it was possible for him to say, with all sincerity, that in his intercourse with men he never knew the sensations of fear, embarrassment, or inferiority." In the grand drama of the Revolution and the subsequent formative and constructive era of our institutions he did not play a commanding consecutive part like that of Washington, Franklin, or Hamilton; his appearances on the scene, even in the years of his principal activities, were fluctuating and interrupted; and indeed his whole career lacks continuity. It is an instance of the unfailing reliability of historical appreciation, which arranges every man's ultimate reputation according to its accurate standard, that, less favored than most of the fathers by such usual recommendations to fame, his figure yet stands forth in proportions of dignity and greatness. His most conspicuous service to his country was as a pioneer in the cause of financial order; and in all his political principles and endeavors he sought the same ends of system and symmetry. He was one of the powerful intellectual leaders who, in an age of confusion, insisted upon stability and poise of government as the essential things, and, wisely

yielding in secondary matters, triumphantly enforced their will in the federal constitution. Aspersed as a monarchist, he was in reality the broadest and most sagacious of political philosophers, who in the crisis of his country strove, and in any other situation of upheaval would have striven, for a scientific construction of government according to the existing state of society and with patriotic view for the future. The singular openness of his mind, its freedom from trammels and conventions, and its receptivity to policies of the best practical advantage in the circumstances, are illustrated by the aspect of his career already referred to, its want of consecutivity;—as a partisan, of either the conservative or the radical description, he would not have lacked the same continuance and elevation in the public service accorded to his not more capable contemporaries. With equal conviction and eloquence he could deliver a eulogium on Clinton the democrat and an oration celebrating the return of the Bourbons; in the one case animated by admiration of a life nobly spent in the cause of human rights, and in the other by enthusiasm at the restoration of universal peace.

Although never a formal author, Morris was an indefatigable writer. His various public papers, orations, and contributions to the press on political and financial subjects are of considerable volume. His private correspondence was very extensive, and is of fascinating interest; and his verse, mostly of a casual character, addressed to friends or produced for his own diversion, reflects his graceful and amiable qualities of mind. The principal works of authority and estimate devoted to him are his "Life and Correspondence," by Jared Sparks (three volumes), his "Diary and Letters," edited by his granddaughter, Anne Cary Morris (two volumes), and a characteristic monograph by President Roosevelt.

Married, December 25, 1809, Ann Randolph, daughter of Thomas Mann Randolph of Virginia.

[She was a descendant of the famous Pocahontas, and of the Randolph, Cary, Page, Wormeley, Fleming, Isham, and other noted families of Virginia.]

Issue:

Gouverneur Morris, 2d; of whom below.

BOOK NOTICES.

The True Andrew Jackson. By Cyrus Townsend Brady, LL.D. With Twenty-three Illustrations. J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia and London, 1906; 504 pages.

We have read this book with keen enjoyment and admiration. To our mind it is the perfect and permanent word about Jackson's personality, deeds, and position in history. Masterful, magnificent man, of purest character and life; lofty and single-minded patriot; splendid general, who required only a sufficient theater of action to rank with the world's prime military leaders; great, very great president; chiefest exemplar of our national life in the intermediate period from Washington to Lincoln, and, in any broad survey of American history, the only figure rivalling these two for heroic proportions and representative associations—such exactly is Andrew Jackson in the ripened verdict of time. Academic controversy respecting the particular policies and transactions of President Jackson has of course not ceased and doubtless never will; indeed, we take it for settled that the burden of economic criticism is and will remain unfavorable to him in the great matter of the Bank; certainly enlightened opinion is unanimous in condemning the spoils system, which was one of the principal positive results of his administration; and some of the aspects of his purely and vehemently personal government are still less to be defended in these days of more exacting standards of official ethics than they were at the height of the party clamor against him. But when all is said the man, the patriot, the general, the president stands in undiminished and unassailable greatness, unquestionably the third in order of historic importance among American public characters.

It is this fundamental view of Jackson, maintained and developed with remarkable ability and interest, that gives to Dr. Brady's book a consequence not claimed for it, or sought, as a formal biography. After Parton, any purely biographical work on Jackson, however brilliant or excellent, must of necessity be but secondary. Neither has Dr. Brady produced new materials of any importance. His book, as a narrative,

is really only a composite of the principal previous biographies, over which, he says, "I have pored long and earnestly." But the treatment of the materials is entirely original, in each chapter tending to a definitive estimate of the man in his many-sided character; and this estimate is uniformly in recognition and reinforcement of the reality and security of his fame.

That Jackson was not only a powerful man, but absolutely sincere and conscientious in every situation in which he was placed; and not only sincere and conscientious, but possessed in the highest degree of that form of ability which we associate with an imperious nature, is, we suppose, as fully and permanently established as anything in the American consciousness. The famous retort of Stephen A. Douglas to President Buchanan upon an occasion of some controversy between them as to the policies of the latter's administration, perfectly expresses this general sense of the supreme personality of Jackson.

"The president became excited, rose, and said: 'Mr. Douglas, I desire you to remember that no democrat ever yet differed from the administration of his own choice without being crushed. Beware of Tallmage and Reeves.'

"Douglas also rose and in an emphatic manner replied: 'Mr. President, I wish you to remember that General Jackson is dead.'"

But side by side with this settled recognition of Jackson's power, integrity, and ability of the special variety alluded to there has always lurked a critical reserve. Born in the backwoods, of a family utterly obscure; uneducated; unindebted in any way, for his rise to political prominence, to intellectual reputation or accomplishment, but wholly to the glory of New Orleans; rejected, in the balanced election of 1824, largely from a scrupulous reluctance to elevate a man of such deficiencies to the presidency; and later, by his course in the matter of Mrs. Eaton, and by other temperamental manifestations, justifying to his enemies their keenest criticisms—must we not, in our favorable estimate of Jackson, be content with the singular positive claims which his character and career afford, and dismiss as merely negligible, in the case of such an individuality, the question of the measure of his attainments and cultivation?

Looking to this side, we find the severest judgments. John Quincy Adams characterized him as "a barbarian who could not write a sentence of grammar and hardly could spell his own name;" and in the

elegant society of the old federalist and new whig regimes "Jacksonism" and "vulgarism" were equivalent ideas.

Well, that was a very ridiculous remark of Adams's; and as for the dear aristocratic ladies, whose male relatives Jackson had the detestable taste to annihilate on every political occasion, we think it no more significant that he was *déclassé* to them than that the little Corsican upstart was impossible to the dames of the Faubourg St. Germain.

Jackson's literary (the word is not so absurdly chosen, as will be seen) productions, including letters and other writings intimately personal, state papers, etc., are the sole test of the quality of his intellectual culture. We infinitely prefer them to Adams's, and would be much astonished at a contrary judgment. They are the productions of a majestic, decisive mind, to which, in both expression and form, they do added honor. We challenge anyone having the love of country in his heart to read the Nullification proclamation without intense admiration and emotion; and the message on the Bank is also magnificent and thrilling. Washington had his Hamilton, Grant his Badeau, and Jackson his Livingston, besides a very competent private secretary. It would be idle to deny that the polish of some of Jackson's state papers is due to another hand; but conception, thought, pith, and sequence are wholly his, and any different opinion at this day, with the understanding of the man at which we have arrived, is simply foolish.

In the intimate writings of Jackson his true self in this aspect appears. Certainly it will not be pretended that any secretary had a part in the touching epitaph to his wife:

"Here lie the remains of Mrs. Rachel Jackson, wife of President Jackson, who died the 22d of December, 1828, aged 61. Her face was fair; her person pleasing, her temper amiable, her heart kind; she delighted in relieving the wants of her fellow creatures, and cultivated that divine pleasure by the most liberal and unpretending methods; to the poor she was a benefactor; to the rich an example; to the wretched a comforter; to the prosperous an ornament; her piety went hand in hand with her benevolence, and she thanked her Creator for being permitted to do good. A being so gentle and so virtuous, slander might wound but could not dishonor. Even death, when he tore her from the arms of her husband, could but transport her to the bosom of her God."

Two autograph letters of Jackson's are reproduced by Dr. Brady, both written hurriedly upon emergent occasions. Aside from pecu-

liarities of abbreviation and defects of punctuation—which characterized nearly all correspondence in those times,—they are what one would expect, for the purposes of their composition, from a man whose pen was accustomed to reflect, with accuracy and credit, the thoughts of a firm, orderly, and distinguished mind.

In no particular is Dr. Brady's book more fascinating than in the picture which it presents of Jackson's private life, traits, and manners. The insinuation of "vulgarity" against such a man recalls the celebrated colloquy: "Do you not think that picture immodest?" "No, but your question is." By all who knew him in a personal way he was beloved with an unqualified love rarely given to the great; no honorable foe ever breathed an intimation against his integrity, purity, and delicacy; and in the nicer amenities of life he was ever the high-minded, courtly, and finished gentleman, whose presence gave an elevation to those who came in touch with him. The persistent allusion to "Jacksonian vulgarity" by a certain element of contemporary society concerned, however, not so much his own person as his associations. He was the chosen one, the idol of the democracy, the low, uncultured masses of the people, with whom his spirit was in sympathy. If that is a reproach it must stand, and indeed become more aggravated the more the facts are examined. But such a point of view will hardly find much avowed support while the republic endures, and least of all at the present day of colossal majorities, which will swing this way or that according as the people consider themselves the better served, but never to any side of even suspected aristocratic pretension.

The Rise of American Nationality, 1811-19. (The American Nation Series, vol. xiii). By Kendrick Charles Babcock, Ph.D., President of the University of Arizona. With Maps. Harper and Brothers, New York and London, 1906; 339 pages.

The eight years reviewed by Dr. Babcock constitute the central and determining period of the organization and establishment of true nationality in the United States; and a happier title could not be assigned his book in the noteworthy series to which it belongs. In the year 1811, so far was the United States from being a "free, sovereign, and independent" nation, as nominally defined and pretended, that it had neither any compacted and firm character as such in the aspect which it presented to its own citizens, nor any recognizable right to so regard and conduct itself in the estimation of foreign powers. That was still the era of the

constitutional factions, waging a terrific warfare of recriminations to no seeming conclusion, in which the principal positive creed of either party appeared to be hatred of the other—federalism, according to the anti-federalists, meaning reversion to a central despotism if not to monarchy, and anti-federalism, according to the federalists, retrogression to the anarchy of the confederation. The great work of judicial interpretation of the constitution, though begun, had not yet progressed far enough to compel an understanding that the national government, whether agreeable to specious theorists or not, would appropriate to itself all the dignity and power not in explicit terms prohibited to it; the Republican organization (which later took the name of the Democratic party), victorious in three successive elections and now supreme, was itself divided into sub-factions, contending about the limitations of governmental powers; and all these conditions seemed to tend in the near future to further chaos, with disruption as the final logical result.

It needed a serious foreign war to save the American people from such disorganizing tendencies and to give to them a sense of the utter nothingness of all other things compared to a homogenous nationality. In this aspect the War of 1812 was fortuitous; it was also just—we think the most just ever waged by the United States as a unit. It was systematically and long provoked by the contemptuous attitude and injurious treatment of Great Britain, which differed in kind—on account of our different political status—from the tyranny that caused the Revolution, but in itself was fully as overbearing and intolerable. That it was not in the emphatic sense a popular war—the declaration of hostilities passed the house by a majority of but thirty in one hundred and twenty-eight and the senate by six in thirty-two,—is but an illustration of the prevalence of faction, before which the exalted and sacred interests of country were inferior to special and involved considerations of one kind and another.

The war wrought a marvellous change, which was most of all apparent in the reconstructed creed of the dominant Republican—soon to be Democratic—party. "The government and party . . . had come into power by the 'revolution of 1801,' strongly emphasizing democratic principles, state rights, and strict construction of the constitution; it emerged from the war in 1815 greatly changed, if not greatly chastened, by fourteen years of experience in administration, including three years of war. . . . Hamilton himself would have

hesitated to take some of the steps which the Jeffersonian Republicans took trippingly. It was this new, nationalized democracy, purged of most of its impractical theories, which found itself triumphant as the result of the war, and apparently endowed with a long lease of power. Nationalism and democracy were to grow together, both reinforced by the development of the west, by the diversion of the attention of the east from commerce to manufacturing, and by the change from attachment to European interests to devotion to internal improvement.

. . . The extent to which the Republicans had adopted federalist positions is perhaps best illustrated by the suggestions in Madison's annual message of 1815; for none but a strong government with liberal endowment of powers could carry out his programme: liberal provisions for defense, an enlarged navy, protection to manufactures, national roads and canals, a national university, more military academies, and—very cautiously—a national bank." Even the bank proposal rapidly took definite shape, and a year later was adopted and put in form by the same party which in 1811 had terminated the first bank charter. And the great interpretive decisions of the supreme court, in affirmation of the exclusive national authority of the United States upon previously disputed points, now also acquired their perfect development, leaving no ground for the strict constructionists to stand upon, and giving to the union that inviolability which Jackson was to sternly defend against experimental nullifiers and Lincoln to preserve against armed secessionists.

To the student of American political history in its broader significance and relations, this book of Dr. Babcock's is an indispensable aid. As a sketch—it does not pretend to be an exhaustive treatise—we think it the most valuable yet produced upon the period which it discusses.

The Fight for Canada. A Sketch from the History of the Great Imperial War. By William Wood, a Navy League Secretary, Major in the Canadian Militia, and President of the Literary and Historical Society of Quebec. Definitive Edition. Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1906; 370 pages.

The author of this book has had the advantage of resources never before—which means in a period of one hundred and fifty years—available to writers on the subject, although, as he says, more ink has been shed in its discussion than ever blood was upon the Plains of Abraham. "The last links in the military evidence," he points out, "were

only filled up in 1903, and the whole subject was only brought within working distance of finality by completing the naval evidence in 1904." To the indefatigable labors of A. G. Doughty, the new archivist of Canada, he ascribes the entire credit for discovering and producing these new and final materials. The results of Mr. Doughty's researches, so far as performed, have been published in six quarto volumes, which, however, by no means exhaust his supply of original unprinted documents. It is the purpose of Mr. Doughty "not only to print word for word every single original that has not already appeared in this way, but also to make a complete index to all original sources whatever, so that every question can be followed up to the end at a moment's notice." Meantime Mr. Wood has digested, in the convenient volume before us, the facts of the whole momentous history, and the narrative thus presented, in addition to its primary merit of conclusiveness, possesses every recommendation of comprehension and proportion, orderly connection, clearness, and style.

Destiny arranged, with a wonderful precision of adjustment and relation one to another, the causes and conditions which led up to the collapse of the French domain in Canada.

The country was but sparsely settled, its population never reaching one hundred thousand; while the British colonies at the south, extending from Maine to Georgia, flourished from the beginning, and at the period of the decisive struggle had fifteen times as many inhabitants as New France. In the character of their colonial system the French were at a similar disadvantage; it was a system of cold-blooded exploitation of the resources of the country—including the accumulations of the miserable colonists—for the emolument of a few official favorites. One of the most graphic chapters in Mr. Wood's book is that on Vaudreuil and Bigot, respectively the governor-general and intendant of Canada.

Vaudreuil, while never convicted of personal peculation, was altogether compliant to his infamous subordinate, who governed the whole revenue and expenditure of the colony, extorting enormous commissions from both. No estimate is given of the corrupt fortune amassed by Bigot during his years of opportunity in Canada; but its colossal proportions may be surmised when it is said that one of his confederates, Cadet, "years afterwards—having first served his term of imprisonment in the Bastille, disgorged six millions, and bought a splendid old estate,—was still able to lend the French government no less than

13,000,000 francs." Tribute was derived from every conceivable public or private interest: the revenues were boldly stolen; vouchers for government contracts were frequently made out for ten times the actual amount; public property was appropriated; there were villainous trade manipulations, prices being thus raised, we are told, a thousand per cent.; and no means, however merciless or paltry, was neglected to wring money from the wretched people individually, many of whom were reduced to feed on grass.

Of a home government which could tolerate such a *régime*, especially after the startling warning of 1745, when the stronghold of Louisburg fell before a New England colonial force, not much could be expected in the comprehensive matter of colonial defense. There were, indeed, no general preparations worthy of the slightest respect as indicating appreciation of the elementary requirements for the retention of Canada. The whole strategy of the war depended upon baffling the British naval plans necessarily involved for a mastery of the situation. To this end it was not needful to acquire preponderance on the high seas, or to wage any sea war whatever; the French had but to hold the St. Lawrence from Quebec to the ocean, a simple common sense matter for a capable administration, it would seem. They did not, and Quebec fell, the advance upon it being entirely by water. The map of the siege tells the fatal story better than words. Its most conspicuous feature is the British fleet in two divisions—ten ships of war in one and eleven in the other—commanding the city from the river.

It is thus seen that no contributory weakness, maladministration, or national inefficiency on the part of the French, which might make certain the loss of Canada, was wanting. On the other hand, every advantage of wise and far-reaching preparation, statesmanlike conception and execution of the essential plans, and coördination of means required, distinguished the conduct of the British offense. Pitt, the great imperial intellect, was at the helm; Anson, as competent a lieutenant as ever prime minister had, was in charge of the admiralty; and at every stage and in every detail we see the intelligent and masterful pursuance of a scheme of conquest which we now know was as surely pre-ordained to win as a campaign of Napoleon's.

The battle itself was but the spectacular conclusion. But while emphasizing the neglected aspects of administrative and naval credit, Mr. Wood is far from seeking to minimize the glory of Wolfe. Indeed, we think that from his hands the great Wolfe tradition is passed on with

a distinct access rather than a diminution; for in telling the story of the "Fight for Canada" with a completeness, truth, and discrimination never before equalled, he has necessarily, by the superior weight of his work, added to the appreciation of the immortal commander. His book also gives unreserved tribute of respect and honor to Montcalm.

The Ruined Abbeys of Great Britain. By Ralph Adams Cram, F. A. I. A., F. R. G. S., Author of "Church Building," etc. James Pott and Company, New York; 307 pages.

A book on this subject is of far more interest to American readers than will be suggested by the title or even by an inspection of its formal contents. From the Introduction, however, a very clear view will at once be derived of the important and indeed essential connection of the abbeys with the foundations of English culture, its development during centuries, and, of still more consequence, the direction of the thought, lives, and most intimate personal interests of the people.

"A monastery was, of course, a house of consecrated men vowed to poverty, chastity, and obedience, and bound to praise and glorify God night and day; but besides this it was a center of law, order, education, and mercy, a Christian citadel in the midst of civil disorder. Somewhere, almost as far away as heaven, were a king and court, names only. At close intervals armies went raging over the country; why, few knew, and fewer cared. Now and then came laggard word of a king slain and of another reigning in his stead: these were the affairs of the nobles, the king's men, and they paid for their knowledge in service and money; for the people, the thousands over the tens, they were matters of profound insignificance. The parish priest was the spiritual guide, the visible agent of the church; but the abbey, priory, and convent were the signs of Christian society, organized, unfailing, permanently operative. . . .

"The greater orders possessed vast landed estates freely given by numberless benefactors, who were themselves originally beneficiaries,—estates managed far more justly and generously than those of secular landlords. These same orders held other estates in trust, and acted as guardians for orphans and minors; they undertook the education of children, the preparation of candidates for holy orders, the maintenance of hospitals and asylums, the medical service of the neighborhood, the relief of the poor, the entertainment of travellers. They were the teachers of the agricultural population in all things pertaining to their industry; they were themselves great producers of grain and wool; they employed large numbers of men in building, carving, printing, bell founding; they were the fosterers of architecture, painting, sculpture, illumination, embroidery, gold-smithery, and organ building. They were

at the same time fallible men, and their vast responsibilities sometimes bred failure, sometimes were responsible for a grievous falling-off in spiritual things; but even if they failed now and then as religious, they succeeded as guardians of society. We read with amazement it may be of the majestic pageantry of some abbot's life; but we must remember that he was not only the head of a religious house, but as well a chief of the people, less a monk than a great Christian ruler, taking the place of secular powers that were frequently impotent for good. Viewed in this light, considering his enormous responsibilities and the amazingly varied nature of the functions he was called upon to perform, we shall find ourselves able to make allowance for him and for the priors and monks over whom he ruled. Called by the insistent clamor of the times to duties never contemplated by St. Benedict or St. Robert, the orders lost undoubtedly some portion of their original spirituality and self-abnegation; but, though they acquired a measure of worldliness, they acquitted themselves nobly of their new responsibilities, and for century after century were the guardians, the leaders, the benefactors of the people."

In another point of view not specially set forth by Mr. Cram, but well indicated by the foregoing, the abbeys must always retain importance in historical study, whether general or particular. Great estates, as he says, were incorporated in them, and others were administered by them. Associated with their history, therefore, are the annals of innumerable families; and the genealogist will frequently find that the family histories that he is elucidating trace back to the venerable abbeys of Great Britain.

The abbeys of which specific accounts are given are Glastonbury, Lindisfarne and Whitby, Beaulieu and Netley, Tintern, Gisburgh and Bolton, Jedburgh and Kelso, Rievaulx and Byland, Melrose and Dryburgh, Kirkstall, St. Mary's York, Malmesbury, and Our Lady of the Fountains. The book is a striking example of conscientious workmanship, both literary and mechanical—the illustrations (nearly seventy in number) being most beautifully executed and printed.

The History of North America: Non-sectional, Non-partisan, Non-sectarian. Based on a Plan suggested to and approved by a Special Committee of the American Historical Association. By Twenty Distinguished Scholars, Assisted by a Board of Forty College Presidents, Forty Professors, and Many Men of Affairs. Guy Carleton Lee, Ph.D., of the Faculty of History, Johns Hopkins University, etc., Editor-in-Chief. George Barrie and Sons, Philadelphia.

We have received from the publishers the first four volumes of

this great and magnificent work. They are: Vol. I: Discovery and Exploration, by Alfred Brittain, in conference with George Edward Reed, LL.D., S. T. D.; Vol. II: Indians of North America in Historic Times, by Cyrus Thomas, Ph.D., in conference with W. J. McGee, LL.D.; Vol. III: The Colonization of the South, by Peter Joseph Hamilton; Vol. IV: The Colonization of the Middle States and Maryland, by Frederick Robertson Jones, Ph.D.

Formal notices of these and the succeeding volumes will appear from time to time in the MAGAZINE. For the present we must confine ourselves to this acknowledgment and the expression of our high appreciation of a historical enterprise altogether unprecedented for dignity, scope, thoroughness, impartiality, and comprehensive scholarship and ability. The complete work embraces twenty volumes, each by a student of history selected in consideration of distinguished labor in research and the closest intimacy between author and subject.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

CONTENTS

Frontispiece: Cornelius Vanderbilt.

A Question of Mormon Patriotism. By Theodore Schroeder	279
New York in the Nineteenth Century. By John Austin Stevens. (<i>Third Paper</i>)	292
The Family Line of George Washington. By Joel M. Eno	315
The Morris Family of Morrisania. By W. W. Spooner	321
The Lewis and Clark Expedition. By Horace S. Lyman	329

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE is issued on the fifteenth day each of January, March, May, July, September, and November, at Three Dollars per annum, Fifty Cents per single copy. Subscribers failing to receive their copies by the first day of the succeeding month should immediately notify the publishers; otherwise it may not be possible to supply the missing number.

The contents of each number are protected by copyright. Permission to reprint any article or illustration must be specially obtained from the publishers.

Advertising rates will be furnished on application; none but strictly high-class advertising matter will be admitted. Advertisements must be received by the fifteenth day of the month preceding the month of issue.

Application made at the New York Post Office for entry as second-class mail matter.

THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK,
Publishers,
41 Lafayette Place,
New York, U. S. A.

Copyright, 1906, by
THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK.

All rights reserved.



CORNELIUS VANDERBILT

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. I

JULY, 1906.

NO. 4

A QUESTION OF MORMON PATRIOTISM.

BY THEODORE SCHROEDER.

THE case of Reed Smoot's eligibility as a United States senator raises again the irrepressible controversy as to the loyalty and patriotism of the Mormon people. This fact gives renewed interest to a historical contention concerning the facts of the relation of our government to the Mormon Battalion in the Mexican War. In Utah this question has been the subject of innumerable superficial newspapers controversies. It is time for a bit of thorough research into the matter.

On the part of the gentile press it is usually insisted that the enlistment was a beneficence granted by the government on solicitation of the needy saints, who having been for incompatibility expelled from Illinois by mob violence, were then on their journey west. It is at times also insisted that when Mormon leaders by denunciatory falsehoods seek to pervert a solicited charity into seeming governmental religious persecution, they evince their own treasonable hatred of American institutions and an utter want of appreciation of American tolerance and love of liberty.

The Mormon contention has varied somewhat according to exigencies. When it was sought to arouse Mormon hordes to more servile obedience of designing leaders, by an appeal to the fear of persecution, the most treasonable denunciations of our government were resorted to. Federal officials were by the Mormon "mouth-pieces of God" publicly denounced as "—, lying, venomous" individu-

als,¹ "from the tag, rag, and bobtail of ———, grogshops, and gambling hells."² The general government was charged with having "actually hugged itself with joy and abbeted those fiendish persecutions," referring to the Mormon expulsion from Illinois. All this, as well as what follows upon the same line, is quoted from official Mormon church publications.

Brigham Young, in another public sermon, said: "There cannot be a more damnable, dastardly order issued than was issued by the administration to this people while they were in an Indian country in 1846. Before we left Nauvoo, not less than two United States senators came to receive a pledge from us that we would leave the United States, and then while we were doing our best to leave their borders, the poor low degraded curses sent a requisition for five hundred of our men to go and fight their battles. That was President Polk, and he is now weltering in hell with old Zachary Taylor, where the present administrators will soon be, if they do not repent.³ There is a high treason in Washington, and if the law was carried out it would hang up many of them. And the very act of James K. Polk in taking five hundred of our men while we were making our way out of the country, under an agreement forced upon us, would have hung him between the heavens and the earth if the laws had been faithfully executed. And now if they can send a force against this people we have every constitutional and legal right to send them to hell, and we calculate to send them there."⁴

At other times the enlistment was declared an "inhuman requisition," partly because "so outrageously and unprecedentedly large."⁵ One who professes such extraordinary

¹vii. *Deseret News*, 229.

²Ibid, 181.

³xx. *Millennial Star*, 33. See also v. *Journal of Discourses*, 152, and vii. *Deseret News*, 228.

⁴vii. *Deseret News*, 228-9; xx. *Millennial Star*, 36; v. *Journal of Discourses*, 235.

⁵vii. *Deseret News*, 181.

sanctity that to question his veracity is an insult to God, has this recorded of him in a church publication: "President George Q. Cannon, writing upon the subject, says: 'Captain Allen did not inform the people, for the reason probably that he knew nothing about it, what the design was in case the battalion was not raised. The secret history of the transaction is as President Young was afterward informed on the best of authority, that Thomas H. Benton, United States senator from the state of Missouri, got a pledge from President Polk that if the Mormons did not raise the battalion of five hundred, he might have the privilege of raising volunteers in the upper counties of Missouri to fall upon them and use them up.'"⁶

Of course if these things were true, the saints were justified in complaining that "Heartless villians had concocted plans to have all the [Mormon] people murdered while upon their western frontiers."⁷ And yet it hardly seems probable that they are telling the truth when they assert that "the authorities of the nation did advocate the doctrine of putting to death all the Mormons, and we know it."⁸

Here is another apostolic harangue: "The government sent an agent and *demanded* five hundred volunteers for the Mexican War, which was two hundred times the proportion raised by the country. *This was* done that teams, and our women, and our children might be left defenseless in the Indian country, and so be killed or perish. They said that if we would furnish them the men we might go on in peace; if not, they would cut us off [kill them] on our journey."⁹

From such premises follows quite logically the statement that "They [the members of the battalion] offered their

⁶Ibid, 206; "Mormon Battalion" by Tyler, 117.

⁷"First General Festival of the Mormon Battalion," 9.

⁸Ibid, 10.

⁹"Rocky Mountain Saints," 248.

lives to save this [the Mormon] people from the evil designed by their enemies."¹⁰ At other times, when Mormon loyalty is being questioned, the latter-day saints claim that the furnishing of this battalion was an act of extraordinary patriotism on their part, and put the people of the United States under everlasting obligations to even succeeding generations of Mormons. To the logical mind it is difficult to understand how an act compelled solely by persecution and in fear of death can be at the same time an act of patriotism toward the persecuting authority. As further and conclusive evidence of the fact that no patriotic motive entered as an inducement toward this enlistment, we call attention to the oft-repeated Mormon boast that the government could not have secured a single volunteer had not the church leaders, whose voice is the voice of God, advised their slavish followers to enlist.¹¹

President George Q. Cannon, to doubt whose veracity is to grieve God, seems to have a wish to atone for the falsehood above quoted from him, for he endeavors to find a new, less harsh, but not wholly truthful cause for complaint. He lately wrote: "The sequel to the solicitation for aid was somewhat in the nature of a surprise. It contemplated not only the granting of the request in a different manner from what was desired, but attached to it conditions which wellnigh swept out of sight all the beneficial features aimed at."¹² Similar falsehoods have been incorporated into innumerable sermons by "inspired" leaders, and are being repeated even to this day.¹³

The saints, wherever located, have had trouble with their neighbors, being successively expelled from Ohio, Missouri, and Illinois. To the latter state they went in 1839, and were received with such open-armed hospitality as only a

¹⁰"First General Festival of Mormon Battalion," 16; also 5-6.

¹¹Ibid, 12; "History of the Mormon Battalion," 116-17; Tullidge's "History of Salt Lake City," 27-8.

¹²xxxii. *Juvenile Instructor*, 650.

¹³"The Inside of Mermonism," 57, and many other places therein.

very generous and liberty-loving people can extend to those whom they honestly believe to be suffering from a wrongful oppression. The conduct of the saints in five years turned this feeling of extraordinarily deep-seated sympathy, inducing great practical charities, into a feeling of very bitter hatred, threatening to break into mob violence.

Joseph Smith, then the Mormon prophet, had secured from the Illinois legislature a most extraordinary municipal charter and a provision for the organization of the Nauvoo Legion, by which every physically able man within Smith's domain was compelled to do military duty. (*Deseret News*, April 1, 1857.). Undoubtedly this was thought desirable as a necessary defense for the prophet and his followers, and also as the nucleus of an army which, by the help of the sword, would establish the temporal kingdom of God. The prophet's budding ambition to be an American Mahomet was keeping pace with the rising anger of neighboring gentiles. It was becoming apparent that the prophet must abandon his astounding aspirations and disreputable methods, fight, or move.

Thus conditioned he sought for means to pursue the first alternative while by force he would resist compulsory removal. It is doubtful if anyone but an eccentric such as was Sidney Rigdon (Smith's first counsellor) would have dreamed of the strange device through which these hopes were to be realized, and which found expression in a petition to congress, dated Nauvoo, Ill., March 26, 1844.

Smith's petition commences with an extraordinary self-glorification, clothed in such extravagant expletives as might be expected in a schoolboy's oration on George Washington. It ends by setting out in full the "ordinance" which he desires congress to pass. The ordinance opens with a recital of over a dozen "whereases," followed by the enumeration of over two dozen more or less desirable objects to be attained by its passage, among them being the protection of emigrants to Oregon and other portions

of the practically unoccupied west, to extend the arm of deliverance over Texas, and to give Smith a chance to show his loyalty.

Then comes the proposed enactment. The first section authorizes Smith to raise a volunteer army of one hundred thousand men, at his own discretion as to time and place. The second makes interference with the carrying out of these plans of Smith, a crime to be punished by hard labor. The third section makes Smith "a member of the army of these United States" without fixing his rank, while the next section expressly says that the volunteers shall not be considered a part of the army of the United States. Thus the aspiring Mahomet hoped to benefit, by having governmental authority back of him while seeking to evade all its controlling authority. Evidently Smith intended to make himself the head of this vast army of free-booters, under conditions which would make them responsible to no one but himself, since the act contemplated no other accountability, unless it be for a violation of Smith's interpretation of the preamble.¹⁴ This silly arrogance was only equalled by that other pitiable exhibition of egomania, through which Smith became a candidate for president of the United States with Sidney Rigdon for his running-mate as vice-presidential candidate. The rage of neighboring gentiles was now at white heat, owing to Mormon wrongs, the discussion of which is not in the province of this essay. The saints claimed that all the resulting enmity was caused by their superior goodness.

Even as early as February, 1844, it became apparent to Mormon leaders that they must move if they persisted in the course outlined by themselves, and a committee was then appointed to seek out a new location in Oregon or California.¹⁵ In June, 1844, the prophet and his brother

¹⁴vii. *Deseret News*, 122. Apostle O. Hyde was sent to Washington with this petition. *Melchisedek and Aaron's Herald*, May, 1849.

¹⁵This statement occurs several times, but I have mislaid my notes. I remember that in a little magazine published in South Dakota about 1900, a statement appeared that one committee had come there.

were killed by a mob, and afterward the same unlawful power exacted from the saints an agreement to leave Illinois, some being allowed to remain behind for the purpose of disposing of the property of all.

Moving was now a matter of compulsion, and the wide, wild west was the only inviting place. President Polk had recommended to congress that stockade forts be built along the road to Oregon, which was then in our possession. The saints were poor indeed, and above all things seemed to need material aid in their migration.

Under date of Nauvoo, January 20, 1846, the "high council" of the Mormon Church issued a circular to "the members of the church throughout the world," in which this is stated: "Should hostilities arise between the government of the United States and any other power, in relation to the right of possessing the territory of Oregon, we are on hand to sustain the United States government to that country. It is geographically ours, and of right no foreign power should hold dominion there; and if our services are required to prevent it, those services will be cheerfully rendered according to our ability."¹⁶

This circular also contained the following: "In the event of the president's recommendation to build blockhouses and stockade forts on the road to Oregon becoming a law, we have encouragement of having that work to do."¹⁷ On the same day, under date "Temple of God, January 20th, 1846," Brigham Young, president, wrote a letter to Elder Jessie Carter Little, a relative of his, in which letter Little was appointed head of the church's New England states missions. The letter also contained this: "If our government shall offer facilities for emigrating to the western coast, embrace those facilities if possible. As a wise and faithful man take every honorable advantage of the times you can. Be thou a saviour and a deliverer of the people, and

¹⁶"Mormon Battalion" by Tyler, 111; "History of the Mormons," 210.

¹⁷"Rocky Mountain Saints," 238.

let virtue, integrity, and truth be your motto—salvation and glory the prize for which you contend.”¹⁸ Elder Little at once repaired to Washington, obtained an interview with President Polk, and secured a promise of active aid from Hon. Amos Kendall, ex-postmaster general.

The above circular of the “high council” was undoubtedly issued with a view to assisting Elder Little in securing the necessary aid. This proclamation and the letter to Elder Little, even when its interpretation is not aided by Smith’s prior petition to congress, could mean nothing else than that the saints would be grateful of an opportunity to enlist in the army as a means of aiding them in their western travels. Doubtless it was also welcome as furnishing a nucleus for a holy soldiery such as Smith had endeavored to organize. Whence, then, President Cannon’s “disagreeable surprise”? Two days after this conference above referred to, Elder Little was informed that it was the intention of President Polk to accept the aid of Mormons in the taking possession of California.

Evidently in accordance with a suggestion from President Polk, Little on June 1, 1846, “addressed an appeal to the president, setting forth some of the grievances of the saints, alluding to their intention to journey westward and testifying to their loyalty.”¹⁹ This appeal is too long to be quoted in full here, but something to indicate its character of frantic insistence must be given as showing the conscienceless character of the men who can in its face declare that a painfully needed charity, when granted, is governmental persecution.

“We would disdain to receive assistance from a foreign power, although it should be proffered, unless our government turn us off in *this great crisis*, and will not help us, and compel us to become foreigners. *Means for the gathering of the poor we must obtain. Thousands are looking to me for help, and I cannot, yea, I will not give myself rest until I can find means for*

¹⁸x1. *Saints’ Herald*, 12; “Mormon Battalion,” 111. The latter authority probably erroneously makes the date of the letter six days later.

¹⁹“Mormon Battalion,” 112.

the deliverance of the poor. In this thing I am determined, and if I cannot get it in the land of my fathers I will cross the trackless ocean, where I trust I shall find some friends to help me.

"But, Mr. President, were you to act alone in this matter, I full well know your course. I am not ignorant of your good feelings towards us, receiving my information from my friend, S. Brannan [a Mormon and Little's predecessor, who had gone to California], and also the Hon. Amos Kendall, and others. Believe me when I say that I have the fullest confidence in you, and we are truly your friends. And if you assist us at this crisis, I hereby pledge my honor, my life, my property, and all I possess, as the representative of this people, to stand ready at your call, and that the whole body will act as one man, in the land to which we are going. And should our territory be invaded, we hold ourselves ready to enter the field of battle, and there fight like our patriot fathers, with our guns and swords and make the battlefield our grave, or gain our liberty. We have not been fighting men, but when we are called into the battlefield in the defense of our country, and when the sword and saber shall have been unsheathed, we declare before heaven and earth, that they shall not return to their scabbards until the enemy of our country or we sleep with the pale nations of the dead, or until we obtain deliverance.

"With great respect I have the honor to subscribe myself

"Your obedient servant,

"J. C. LITTLE.

"Agent of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in the Eastern States."²⁰

Now let the reader turn back, re-read Brigham Young's sermons, quoted in the forepart of this article, and then judge for himself of the honesty and patriotism of these latter-day "mouthpieces of God."

When Elder Little was expressing, on behalf of the Mormons, such undying devotion to our government that they would not accept foreign aid, he was either acting a true Mormon or was woefully ignorant of his own people. In November of 1846, and but six months after Elder Little's petition was written and with full notice²¹ that President Polk had given aid by authorizing Mormon enlistment, the English saints, under the instruction and guidance of apostles and elders from America, petitioned the queen of

²⁰xl. *Saints' Herald*, 13; "Mormon Battalion," 111; Tullidge's "History of Salt Lake City," 27-8; Bancroft's "History of Utah," 240; "Rocky Mountain Saints," 239.

²¹ix. *Millennial Star*, 117.

England to aid them in possessing and holding Vancouver Island and portions of Oregon as a part of her majesty's empire.²²

What arrant fraud was all this former boast of loyalty to the United States! The money received by the enlisted Mormons was indeed a great help to a needy people. The opportunity was such a desirable one that ten per cent. more than answered the requirement of the call were glad to and did attach themselves to the army, as a means of securing the government aid,²³ and twice as many as were called for volunteered to enlist.²⁴ No requisition or draft was made by the government. Captain Allen, who enlisted the men, went with no requisition order of any kind, but solely with the message from General Kearney that he would accept the services," etc.²⁵ What then becomes of the lying complaint as to the excessiveness of the draft?

Out of the money paid by the United States to these Mormon soldiers for the purpose of clothing them, a purse of nearly \$6,000 was made up at Leavenworth and given to Apostle Parley P. Pratt to take back to Brigham Young.²⁶ It seems that these five hundred enlisted Mormons also received from the government a bounty of \$40 each,²⁷ making a total of \$20,000, all of which was taken by that same Brigham Young.²⁸ John D. Lee, the blood-atoner, later of Mountain Meadow massacre fame, followed the Mormon soldiers as far as Sante Fe for the purpose of bringing back this cash to his master.²⁹

In those days, when no selfish ends were to be served, the treasonable leaders frankly admitted the charity for which

²²viii. Ibid, 142, and ix, 75; vii. *Deseret News*, 228.

²³xxxii. *Juvenile Instructor*, 651; Tyler's "Mormon Battalion."

²⁴Elder John T. Caine before the committee on territories of the house of representatives, January 16, 1889.

²⁵"The Story of the Mormons," by Alexander Linn, 371.

²⁶"Autobiography of Parley Pratt," 384.

²⁷"Life of John Taylor," 176.

²⁸"Rocky Mountain Saints, 247."

²⁹Lee's "Mormonism Unveiled," 286; Hyde's "Mormonism," 143.

they afterward demanded the hanging of President Polk. Here is one such admission from Apostle (afterward Prophet) John Taylor: "He [President Polk] has sent out orders to have five hundred of our brethren employed for one year, and then to be discharged in California, and to have their arms and implements of war given them at the expiration of the term, *and as there is no prospect of any opposition it amounts to the same as paying them for going to the place where they were destined to go without.*"³⁰

The war with Mexico had so far progressed that Brigham Young felt safe in declaring to the parting battalion that "he would promise that if we [the members] would go and do right we would never have a ball shot at us by the enemy we were going against."³¹ And this prophesy proved to be true. The Mormon Battalion was not engaged in a single battle.

The saints were then so grateful to President Polk and the Democratic party for this assistance thus given, that all those remaining in Nauvoo voted the democratic ticket in the election of August, 1846. This statement is made on the authority of Elder Almon Babbitt. Governor Ford of Illinois says so determined were they that their support should be efficient, that "they all voted three or four times for member of congress."³²

Colonel Thomas Leiper Kane, who probably wrote Elder Little's petition heretofore quoted from, had rendered the saints most valuable aid toward securing the government assistance. What more appropriate then than that Elder Little should suggest that Colonel Kane be appointed the presidential messenger to carry the authority for enlistment of Mormons to General Kearney, then at Port Leavenworth? And so it came to pass.³³ Later Kane accom-

³⁰viii. *Millennial Star*, 117 (November 15, 1846).

³¹"Festival of the Mormon Battalion," 32; Tyler's "Mormon Battalion," 118 or 188; Gunnison's "History of the Mormons," 133.

³²Ford's "History of Illinois," 414.

³³xl. *Saints' Herald*, 11.

panied Elder Little most of the way to the Mormon camp,³⁴ became better acquainted with the saints, and was so completely hypnotized as to be ever afterward their partisan defender.³⁵ So thoroughly did his sympathies blind him to the real condition of the saints that he credited them with a most unusual supply of every virtue and proclaimed the absence of every vice. Even so late as 1850, when everybody except Colonel Kane knew the latter-day saints to be polygamists, if they knew anything of Mormonism at all, he declared from personal knowledge that the charges were untrue; said the saints all lived blameless lives; declared a forty-ply polygamist a man of singular purity of character, and quoted the lying "Doctrine and Covenants" in support of his declaration.³⁶ But this an aside.³⁷

On August 7, 1846, Colonel Kane arrived at the Mormon camp at "winter quarters" and held a consultation with the Mormon apostles. Then "it was there resolved that an address to President Polk should be framed, expressive of the gratitude of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints toward him, for his benevolent design of arming and planting five hundred of our volunteers in California and for our good."³⁸

I believe I have sufficiently demonstrated that what has

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Hyde on Mormonism.

³⁶Original edition of his address before the Pennsylvania Historical Society; also "Story of the Mormons," 374.

³⁷NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—Thomas Leiper Kane was a gentleman of noted family from Pennsylvania (where now his widow and descendants reside)—brother of Dr. Kane, the eminent Arctic explorer. He served with heroism and distinction in the Civil War, rising to the rank of brigadier-general. In a memoir of the Kane Family which I have written and which is soon to be published, the following is said of his connection with the Mormons: "In a visit to the Mormon settlements, he was instrumental in relieving the sufferings of these people, then on their pilgrimage to Utah; and eleven years later, when an armed conflict seemed to be impending between the Mormons and the United States government, he went to Utah at his own expense, bearing letters from President Buchanan, and possessing the confidence of both sides, arranged the basis of settlement which was afterward concluded by the commissioners." This note is added in justice to the memory of General Kane, whose friendly views of the Mormons—however they may be criticised by controversialists—unquestionably sprang from the generosity of his nature.—W. W. S.

³⁸"Rocky Mountain Saints," 247.

been by Mormon leaders denounced as a most damnable hardship, imposed upon the Mormon people by an outrageous desire for governmental persecution, was in fact a beneficence bestowed upon them in response to their urgent petition for much needed alms. It has also been demonstrated that when the supposedly inspired leaders denounced the government and its president as *particeps criminis* in persecution, they often knowingly and deliberately lied for the purpose of fostering a treasonable sentiment in their ignorant following, which hatred and fear of the government could be used by the church chiefs to increase the servility of the ignorant Mormon horde.

The common people, by too much ignorance of the facts and a still greater overdose of confidence in the veracity—yea, infallibility—of their priests, were so wrought upon that the very men who took the oath of allegiance in enlisting were ready and willing a few years after to take an equally solemn oath that they would themselves swear that upon the United States they would avenge the blood of the prophets shed at the Carthage (Ill.) jail, and if they could not do it that they would swear their children to never rest or give up till the blood of their prophets should be avenged upon all dwelling on the earth.³⁹

The common herd of Mormons has been treasonable chiefly through want of knowledge as to the real facts, and a perversity which is carefully cultivated by those unscrupulous ones who were by them revered as "the mouthpieces of God." If the reformatory work upon Mormons has not been as effective as is desirable, it is only because those in charge of it have not taken the most effectual or direct methods of educating the erring simple saint out of those fundamental errors which logically lead him into the grosser ones.

³⁹See the admission in the account of the "First General Festival of the Renowned Mormon Battalion," p. 24, and the statements under oath of many apostates, some of which have been repeated in the Smoot investigation. Also see *Journal of Discourses*, vii., 51, i., 208, and iv., 223; xv. *Millennial Star*, 728.

NEW YORK IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BY JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS.

Third Paper.

THE DEVELOPMENT PERIOD—TRADE EXTENSION—NEW YORK
THE METROPOLIS.
1825-50.

(From a historical address.)

AS the first quarter was a period of internal construction, so that which followed it was one of external development.¹ The canals to the north and the west were completed and a scheme of a railroad to Buffalo was already conceived. Our warehouses groaned with the products of the great lakes, while coastwise steamers were supplementing sailing vessels in the delivery of cotton, rice, and other staples from the southern states and the products of the cane from the West India Islands for distribution to the eastward by the Sound, to the northward by the great waterway of the Hudson, and further by the Champlain Canal. New York had now become the heart of

¹It was not possible in the last paper to note all the interesting undertakings of the first quarter of the century. The Navy Yard at the Wallabout owes its establishment to the acquisition of a large tract of land by the United States between 1801 and 1807. The application of steam to the river ferries dates from 1812. The first public school was established in 1816. Gas was introduced into the lower part of the city in 1823.

The visit of Lafayette in 1824 was an interesting event, but the one impressive pageant forever memorable, and second only in its significance to the federal procession on the adoption of the constitution, was the "Marriage of the Waters" of the great lakes with the Atlantic Ocean in 1825—a ceremony which announced the completion of the Erie Canal. The event was heralded by the continuous booming of cannon from Buffalo and along the banks of the Hudson to New York. On the morning of the 25th of October Governor Witt Clinton, with a distinguished company, left the waters of Lake Erie and made a triumphal progress to the Atlantic Ocean at Sandy Hook.

trade, the great mart of the country to which men flocked from the east, the west, and the middle states, and the south, and the north, and even Canada, to sell their produce and buy their supplies. Thus early New York had earned and deserved the name of the metropolis—the mother city of American trade.

The application of steam gave a sudden and continued impulse to the freight traffic from the canals. The Hudson was soon patrolled by steam tugs waiting for a tow of the long processions of canal boats as they emerged upon its waters. At night the lights for miles seemed on those tugs as continuous as the street lamps of a city, and were ever changing objects of interest to the dwellers on the river banks.²

²Charles King in his *Recollections* gives many interesting anecdotes of Stevens and Fulton. He tells us that when the "Clermont" started for Albany on the 7th of August, 1807, it was jeered by the crowd. Robert Fulton and half a dozen friends were on board. The trip took thirty-two hours' running time. The return trip was made in thirty hours, five miles an hour. The engine was made by the famous Watts at Birmingham, England. This event was not even noticed in the newspapers of the day, yet Stevens and Fulton were perfectly aware of the possibilities of their venture. Fulton told George Barlow that the steamboat would give a cheap conveyance to merchandise in all our great rivers. The "Clermont" enlarged was called the "North River" and gained by a quarter of an hour a twenty years' monopoly, granted by the legislature, to navigate at not less than four miles an hour. John Stevens later built the "Phoenix," which he ran to New Brunswick, this being the first vessel that attempted the Atlantic ocean, indeed any ocean. Later he built a boat which made thirteen miles, and in 1850 nineteen to twenty were made. Fulton had never hoped for more than nine. Stevens also invented the propeller, but it was many years before it supplanted the paddle. The "Hoboken," built by Robert L. Stevens in 1822, was the first side-wheel-er; until then the paddles were in the stern. Then came ferry-boats and floating bridges to rise and fall with the tides. As an instance of the rapid increase of the use of steam in New York, it is only necessary to state that in 1826 the arrivals and departures of river steamboats at New York City reached sixty-four hundred, transporting three hundred and twenty thousand passengers. To John Stevens also we owe the tubular boiler, now in universal use in locomotives. He connected this city with Philadelphia by rail, by the Camden and Amboy road, in 1831. These lines were in full daily operation long before Europe had made any progress. The precision of Stevens's knowledge is startling. He said in 1812 that there was "no definite limit to the speed obtainable on land, and saw nothing to hinder steam carriages from moving on these ways at the rate of a hundred miles an hour, though it were probable it would not be convenient to exceed thirty to forty." It was Mr. Stevens who invented the T rail, which insures safety to travel. The immediate additions to the comforts and luxuries of life were innumerable. In 1850 the Erie already brought tons of strawberries.

The vast accumulation of produce thus brought into the city demanded a large addition to its warehouses and wharves, and more than all required a rapid development of facilities for internal distribution; a development soon forthcoming in the application of steam to land conveyance. This was first practically applied to railroads in New York State in 1830, when the Mohawk and Hudson Railroad, connecting Albany with Schnectady, was opened. This was the small beginning of that intricate northern network of railway which was later the nucleus of the New York Central system and which under the genius of Cornelius Vanderbilt, became one of the great arteries whereby the traffic of the west is brought to New York. But the Erie Railway from New York to Buffalo was the pioneer of our New York trunk lines. This was an early project,³ but it was not till 1830 that the enterprise took a definite shape and its beginnings were made. After many setbacks the Erie was finally completed about 1861.

And here a word of tribute to the genius of that railroad magnate of our country, Cornelius Vanderbilt. To his marvellous power of organization we owe the extension of the New York system, which is now but the eastern end of a grand continental system reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Of the men who have amassed colossal fortunes in this city it can be said especially of Mr. Vanderbilt that he did more for the city than the city ever did for him, and that his accumulations were the acquirement of his own genius and not the result of lucky investment by some remote ancestor. To no man since De Witt Clinton is New York so much indebted for its material prosperity as to Mr. Vanderbilt.

Additions and sundry improvements to the railroad systems of the eastern and middle states soon changed the gen-

³The route was approved by three commissioners, James Gore King, John A. Stevens, and Samuel B. Ruggles, who with their wives surveyed the beautiful country from a coach.

eral mode of travel, as well as of freight conveyance. The Harlem Railroad, chartered in 1831 and completed in 1837, was the first to extend beyond the island. It began at the City Hall and in 1841 reached to Fordham in Westchester County. The Hudson River Railroad, chartered in 1846, was opened to East Albany in 1851.⁴ The Morris and Essex was chartered in 1835; the Lackawanna and Western in 1849, being later consolidated with the Delaware and Cobbs Railroad, chartered in 1850. They were not as yet, but soon to become by reaching from the Hudson to the west, trunk lines and feeders of western products to the metropolis. These were all developments of the second quarter of the century, but their far-reaching results were not fully realized till later. The Long Island system was not as yet started.

The first practical use of steam on our seaboard was on a line to Charleston, S. C., of which the "Southerner," in 1846, was the pioneer vessel. It was quickly followed by others of the same order, making weekly trips. These ships were of fifteen hundred tons burthen and in every way first-class. They were all built in New York. The second of them, the "Northerner," was taken off soon after and sold for the Pacific, running between Panama and San Francisco; a steamship connected the Charleston line with Havana. These vessels were all built on shares, the southern merchants taking a large part, as well as the builders and furnishers.

And now the business of the hour was to find foreign markets for the produce accumulated here, to increase our communication with those markets by steam power, to supply the food of Europe, to win our share in the clothing of the

⁴The number of passengers over the New York and New Haven in the year ending 1852 was 744,830; over the Harlem Road, 615,076; over the Hudson River Railroad from October, 1849, to April, 1850, 188,604. The freight receipts on the New Haven for the year ending September 30, 1851, were \$9,206,050; and on the Hudson Railroad from January to April, 1850, \$10,457,880.

Oriental peoples, and with our own vessels to seize the carrying trade of the world. It has been shown how during the continental wars and the struggle of Napoleon with the feudal system of Europe on land and the ambition of Pitt on the sea, the United States grasped a part of this trade, and how it was lost. It was now before the close of the second quarter of the century to be seen whether unaided and unfavored we could regain that loss in free, unshackled competition with Great Britain.

Steam communication across the Atlantic was established by English merchants with the steamships "Syrius" and "Great Britain" in 1838. The beginning of the American system of ocean steam navigation is found in the mail contracts of the secretary of the navy in 1847. These were three in number: first, for five ships to carry the mails from New York to Liverpool; second, from New York to New Orleans, touching at Charleston and Havana and to Chagres; third, for the transmission of the mails from Panama to Oregon, touching at the California ports. Other contracts followed.

The Bremen line, under contract with Edward Mills, a New York merchant, was the pioneer of the American lines. The ships of the Collins Line under the Liverpool contract were all built here. The "Atlantic" sailed from this port for Liverpool April 4, 1847, on her first voyage. She was followed by the "Pacific" early in the summer, by the "Baltic" in November, and the "Arctic" in December. They cost much more than their rivals, the Cunarders, were much finer in their appointments, and were of a higher rate of speed. The story of their triumphs and their disasters belongs to a later period than that now under review. In 1847 also Fox and Livingston took the Havre contract with fine vessels. In 1856 Marshall O. Roberts took the Pacific coast contract.

But all was not plain sailing in those days. Young countries are always too enterprising for their capital. Many,

indeed most, of the undertakings of the United States had been based upon foreign capital. Even the Merchants' Exchange, erected in 1839 on the site of the earlier building in Wall Street, which had been burned in the great fire of 1835, was built with British money under a mortgage of \$800,000. The old Custom House now occupies the site and is valued at five millions of dollars.

Specie, as Mr. Gallatin wrote in 1839, was to the United States a "foreign product." What little we had was with difficulty obtained, and with still greater held, and always subject to recall in the many fluctuations of the English money market. We were still, after the third quarter of the century began, a debtor nation, and a debtor nation cannot hold coin except by favor.

Still the banks of New York, under the state system, held their own to the advantage of their stockholders, and to the satisfactory accommodation of the public until the removal of the deposits from the Bank of the United States by Jackson plunged the country again into the sea of paper money. Again, as in 1815, the country banks ran riot with their issues, until three hundred new banks competed with each other as to which could put out the most currency. The consequent inflation exceeded anything before or since, and the crash of 1837 was the most formidable in our history. Coming so soon after the fire of 1835, it seemed at first an irretrievable blow; but the merchants did not lose heart. New York's bankers were thoroughly trained, and moreover had the advantage of the advice of the most experienced financier of the day, Albert Gallatin, who after long service at home and abroad, had made his home in our city. Under his inspiration, and with the aid of five millions of specie obtained from the Barings by the banking house of Prime, Ward, and King, they resumed in 1839. There was something of a stringency in 1844, but on the whole no further financial troubles till after the close of the second half of the century. Those who were not witnesses of the crash of

1837 can have little idea of the wide extent of the disaster. My recollection is as a youth of my wonder at the number of ill-clad and shoeless vagrants in the streets and of the crowds that clustered around the gratings of the Astor House kitchen for at least an odor of food.

In reviewing this branch of progress we have the benefit, as in the review of the first period, of two admirable addresses. Of these, one was delivered before the New York Historical Society in 1853 at Metropolitan Hall by Mr. John A. Dix, then a veteran in the science of political economy. His earlier essay in that direction we have noticed. The title of his new theme was "The City of New York: Its Growth, Destiny, and Duties." The second of the addresses, by the Hon. Charles King, covered the same period.

Mr. Dix's address is illustrated with tables of statistics, marshalled in admirable manner and showing the correctness of his previous prophetic estimate. Describing the changes in the physical condition of the city, he notes that at the beginning of the century "the place of public execution was in Franklin street, on account of its distance from the abodes of the people and the busy haunts of commerce and industry." In 1850 at least eight of the twenty-two square miles of surface which the island contained were covered and the population of the city proper had risen to five hundred and fifty thousand souls. As he found his predictions of a quarter of a century before justified, he now declared that the population would flow into surrounding spaces. It had already crossed the East River, the North River, and Harlem. Brooklyn, Williamsburg, Jersey City, and Morrisania were all dependencies of the great metropolis. He said a circle with a radius of four miles in extent and with its centre at Union Square then enclosed seven hundred and fifty thousand people; and he predicted that in 1865 the same area would contain one million, five hundred thousand, and in 1880 three million people. London had then, in 1850, a population of two and a half

millions in a surface of forty square miles. To-day Greater New York has a population of over four millions.

Noting the changes that steam has made, he said: "Our communication with Lake Erie and the agricultural supplies it receives from the northwestern states is more speedy and certain than it was with Dutchess County fifty years before, and a distance of five hundred miles is more easily overcome in travel and transportation than one of fifty miles at the beginning of the century." Noting also the public improvements of the second quarter of the century, he found that "the Croton Aqueduct, which conveys the Croton River across the Harlem, compares well in solidity and beauty of its construction with that spanning the valley of Alcantara,⁵ or with that magnificent structure two thousand years old which stretches across the Campagna, through which imperial Rome was perpetually refreshed by the pure water of distant hills." For the future he then considered that New York must look to her commercial wealth. Her commerce had already been pushed to the very confines of the habitable globe. All this he says her merchants had accomplished by their own unaided energies. They had not, like the mercantile classes of England, been aided by a direct trade with extensive colonial dependencies. They had cast themselves on the ocean self-reliant and fearless, and entered into triumphant competition with the whole commercial world; by the beauty, speed, and comfort of their ships they had left all rivals at an immeasurable distance behind, and vindicated the freedom of commerce from restriction.

This, it must be remembered, was before the Civil War had made changes in our basic conditions; before steam vessels, which could be built in England cheaper than here, had monopolized the carrying trade, even on long voyages, and before our efforts in the same line were handicapped by

⁵This was the great bridge over the Tagus at Alcantara, built by the Emperor Trajan. A triumphal arch forty feet high still remains.

the withdrawal of our subsidies—a part of the uniform policy of the southern statesmen, whose influence dominated our national councils, to cripple northern enterprise and arrest the development of our commerce, in the hope that a tender of it to Great Britain would insure a recognition of the confederacy they already contemplated.

Passing to considerations of another order, Mr. Dix observed with regret the extraordinary aggregations of wealth, which he held, unless rightly improved, to be never desirable; and he warned us that this was the great danger to be guarded against. We are now experiencing this very danger. There is a point beyond which such aggregations will not be allowed. The moment they become a danger to the state, that spirit of communism under law which has distinguished New York legislation since universal suffrage was established within its limits will find some way to protect the individual—perhaps through the operation of a succession tax, perhaps by direct and drastic measures. It seems monstrous indeed that men whose fortunes have been made solely from the rise of real estate through the labor of others, should be permitted to escape personal taxation by a nominal change of residence, while all their material interests are here.

Mr. Dix noticed that the most common manifestation of lavish expenditure of that day was in costly private dwellings. We have, said he, "Like Genoa, whole streets of palaces, but without her apology for them" and he adds: "Nothing can be more unwise than the erection of costly dwellings which can only be maintained by princely fortunes—because without primogeniture evanescent."⁶ But since that day the enormous increase of the fortunes, already great a half century ago, has placed them out of the range of ordinary fluctuation. While all other values rise

⁶At the period of which he writes the long line of brownstone buildings—we would hardly call them palaces to-day,—which extends the entire length of Fifth Avenue from Washington Square to Central Park, had hardly begun, and the march of residence has long since left them abandoned to trade.

and fall, that of real estate, as in London and Paris, not only maintains itself, but rises in regular ratio. Taxation does not materially affect its income, and its tendency is daily concentration into fewer hands, until, as in London, the fee will soon be no longer purchasable. Mr. Dix found that one of the greatest securities of New York, so far as the cultivation of our social affections is concerned, was that the city was so closely connected by railways with the rural districts. In an hour the merchant, the clerk, the artisan, the workmen could reach the pure air of the country. There were already in that day numerous villages occupied by New York people, with their schools for children, and the Sunday in the fields. Mr. Dix had observed that rural scenes and rural occupations, above all causes, have given to the higher classes in England an intellectual and corporeal vigor, and he compared them with the same classes in Europe to the disadvantage of the latter. But if this view held good in 1850 it certainly does not to-day. For though perhaps there is not so much interest in athletic sports in France or Germany, there is certainly quite as general a love of rural life as a relief from city toil, and quite as many facilities for reaching and enjoying it.

Of architecture, he remarks that the era of Grecian pediments and colonnades for private dwellings was happily past and that Norman, Gothic, modern Italian, and English cottage styles had superseded them to our great gain in rural establishments. This of course applied to the immediate neighborhood of the metropolis. He observes that a subject of the greatest interest among our intelligent citizens was the establishment of an American Academy of Art, the foundation for a collection of pictures. This, with the exception of a great public park, he considered to be the only want of the city that could be supplied by itself as individuals. Popular education was amply provided for by law, and the preaching of the gospel by the voluntary system. Public charities healed the sick, fed the hungry, clothed the

naked. The Central Park was still in embryo. But of the art gallery Mr. Dix had given up all hope, unless by individual effort and thought it could only be founded by the work of one man, like Astor or Cooper; and perhaps to stimulate a noble ambition he said that in establishments such as these the munificence of republics and republicans is best displayed.⁷ Individual profusion is at war with the spirit of the system under which we live, and can only bring with it unmixed evil. Public institutions for the elevation of industry and the perfection of art are the glory of the government. "To insure our stability as far as possible, and maintain our institutions, society must not set up distinctions unknown to the system itself, and give them by habit or conventional functions an influence at war with it. We must not weaken what was designed to be secure, or introduce what was designed to be restricted." What would the philosophic gentleman of the old school think to-day of the artificial flummery of the "smart set," or the still more contemptible snobbery of the last days of the century, when what is called "society" was ruled by a female council as arbitrary as the Council of Ten?

In this essay General Dix confines himself to a philosophic examination of our life. It covers a period which had been under his personal observation, and subjects of which he was an acknowledged master. No word of mine could do such justice to the theme.

A word must be said of the distinguished traits of the New York merchants to whom it is by all acknowledged that the wonderful prosperity of the city is due. At the close of the eighteenth century the London merchant, the Amsterdam merchant, the Turkey merchant, the Spaniards who traded on the Spanish Main—all had their peculiar character-

⁷The Metropolitan Museum, the Museum of Natural History, and the Botanical Garden have demonstrated, however, that all that is necessary is to provide suitable homes for the treasures of nature and art. Individual contributions rapidly fill their spaces.

istics, and were typical of their races. The New York merchant trading with them all was more cosmopolitan than any one of them. Of that race of men who since 1790 had enjoyed a world-wide fame it may perhaps be said that they were as a rule of superior education to those of any foreign nation. Not a few were college-bred at Yale or Columbia; not a few had made the continental tour; they joined culture to enterprise. The plain Saxon English of the Chamber of Commerce reports is not excelled by the documents of our statesmen, or our lawyers, or our jurists. The race is of the past. The late Mr. A. A. Low was the last survivor of the merchant princes.

In the Dutch days the traveller noted that ten languages were spoken on Manhattan Island, that eighteen pieces of gold coinage of the mintage of different nations circulated here. At the beginning of the nineteenth century Spanish was the language of commerce, and the knowledge of French not an exceptional acquirement in New York. Yet in the colonial days there were few who could really be called merchants who owned their vessels and their cargoes, who traded to distant ports with their merchandise, who sold in bulk and rarely condescended to retail their cargoes. The colonial warehouses in Hanover Square held a motley stock; hogsheads of sugar and molasses hobnobbed with pipes of brandy and rum and maderia, and about every conceivable article of hardware in close companionship. Later this was changed, and commerce settled on regular lines. After 1817 the merchant became exclusive, and no man was admitted into the Chamber of Commerce unless engaged in foreign trade.

It is impossible to more than name a few of the great merchants of this period. Mention may be made of the Griswolds, a family of merchant princes, of whom Mr. Nathaniel Griswold is also celebrated for his contributions to the prosperity of New York in his extension and improvement of our dock system, especially in the construction of

the Great Atlantic Dock; of Grinnell, Minturn, and Company, who controlled the trade with Great Britain; of Howland and Aspinwal, whose clippers, fast and neat as modern yachts, with their polished timbers and brass fittings, were the glory of the Chinese waters; of Spofford and Tileston, the pioneers in the southern steamship lines. In other walks we may notice James Boorman, the prime mover in the Hudson River Railroad, opened in 1852; the banking houses of Brown Brothers and Prime, Ward, and King, the factors of English capital in this country, by whom our great western railroads were built; Albert Gallatin, Cornelius Lawrence, and John A. Stevens, the presidents of the great banks which controlled the finances of the metropolis, and whose opinions weighed in national and financial concerns; Alexander T. Stewart, the wonder of his day for his sagacity and enterprise and his first development of the drygoods shop into a great emporium of trade; and Robert L. Stuart, who repeated on a large scale the successes of the Bayards, the Livingstons, the Cuylers, and the Rhinelanders in the refining of sugars, and whose matchless candy product was to be found in every mart in Europe, even in the upper hamlets of the valleys of the Alps.

In the last years of the first half of the century occurred historic events fraught with enormous consequences to the growth and prosperity of New York. These were the Irish famine of 1844, which determined the immigration to the United States; the social revolutions in France and Germany in 1848, which determined a similar movement from Germany, and the announcement early in 1849 of the discovery of gold in California, which made this the land of promise to the suffering millions of Europe then still in the throes of the most serious social disturbance since the great Revolution of 1789—the resulting movement being referred to by Mr. Everett in one of his addresses as exceeding in numbers the invasion of the Huns and Vandals which overran western Europe.

Allusion has been made to King's "Progress of New York during the Last Fifty Years, with Notices of the Principal Changes and Important Events." This lecture was read before the Mechanics' Society at Mechanics' Hall in 1857. Mr. Charles King, a ripe scholar, was then the president of Columbia College. Some of his recollections may be recalled with profit and with pleasure, because they are of his own personal experience.

In the year 1800, the beginning of the period which he covers, Colonel Richard Varick was the mayor of the city. He was a federalist of the old school, a personal friend of Washington, who had entrusted to him the management of his papers. In 1801 he was succeeded by Edward Livingston, the brilliant young congressman, who was one of the shining lights of the democratic, or, as it was then styled, the republican party. So odd has been the shaping of parties and of names of parties in a single century. Broadway as a street then terminated at Catherine Street and Anthony Street (now called Worth), beyond which it was called the Middle Road. At Anthony Street was a hill with a frame house. Beyond this was a hill country sloping on one side to the Fresh Water Pond or Kolek on the east (site of the present Tombs), and to the lowlands of the Lispenard Meadows on the west. On the east side of the road was Colonel Barclay's seat close to the site of the Carlton House of our day. Still higher up was Colonel Bayard's seat, later occupied as the Vauxhall by Delacroix; Lafayette Place was cut directly through this property. On the west side of the road were the residences of John Jacob Astor and of William Neilson. The limitation of habitation was on the North River at Harrison Street, on the East River at Rutgers Street. A pale fence stretched across the Middle Road [Broadway] at Astor Place, the beginning of the farm of Captain Randall, founder of Sailors' Snug Harbor. It had belonged to Andrew Elliot, the last English lieutenant-governor in the New York Province, who called it

"Minto," after a seat of his family's abroad. Randall styled the building the "Mansion House." It stood on the sandy hill which intersected the line of Broadway. It was long lived in by a Mr. Farquhar, a wine-dealer whose name was perpetuated by some fine Madeira. It was not till many years later that Broadway was opened through Randall's place and Brevoort's market garden beyond.

On the east side of Lispenard's Garden, in the immediate vicinity of St. John's Church on Hudson Square, there was a pond which was filled up in 1804 by order of the vestry of Trinity. These gentlemen had selected this rather unhealthy locality. They had been offered a plot of six acres on the Broadway line, but refused it, saying the land was not worth fencing in. On the rocky backbone of the island the soil had gradually washed away and left a treeless, shrubless, and stony waste. Yet this very drainage prepared it for future residence.

The Dutch settled on the shores where the washings from the uplands gave them some soil for their farms; hence the island was literally surrounded by settlements as far as Harlem, while the interior was bare and unoccupied as late as 1772. All these sterile lands were conveyed by the legislature to the corporation as of little value, but needing care. In 1850 they were dotted with institutions for the deaf and dumb, blind and orphan asylums. From the character of the dry soil these lands were well suited to their purposes.

The City Hotel, which from the time of its building by the Tontine Association in 1792 was the most noted house of entertainment in the city, as its predecessor on the same site, the City Arms or Province Arms, had been for a half century before, disappeared about 1848. It had an assembly room, the "Long Room" of the elder time with a double floor for dancing. It had been acquired by John Jacob Astor and was later the site of the Boreel Building (115 Broadway), which in its time has been torn down in the march of modern change. (We can hardly say improvement.) Mr.

Astor erected the Astor House, which followed the City Hotel as the great house for public entertainment. Its history is associated with that of many famous statesmen who made it their headquarters.

The Public School Society was incorporated in 1805 and opened its schools some years later. It was urged by the Society of Friends and especially aided by De Witt Clinton. In 1842 the ward school system, supported by taxation and giving free education, was authorized by the legislature. The number of schools in 1850 in charge of the society was one hundred and fifteen, and of ward schools forty-five, with more scholars than the former. The corporate schools connected with colleges and asylums and academies all had state aid. The appropriations in 1849 were \$1,199,783; the number of scholars 83,595. The Mechanics' Society, originally established for benevolent purposes, founded an Apprentices' Library and Reading Room. In 1850 it had five hundred and seventy scholars.

Mr. King, describing the yellow fever of 1823, says: "I used daily to ride on horseback from the corner of Bleecker Street over the open Commons to the Custom House located at Greenwich." Yet such was the wealth poured into the city through the canal that in 1839 this entire section was covered with houses, and it was my own daily habit at that period to walk from that same corner to Peugnet's French School in Bank Street.

Gas was introduced into New York in 1823. It was made from oil by an apparatus brought from England, and was sold at one hundred dollars per one hundred cubic feet. In 1850 the price had fallen to thirty cents. Rosin was occasionally used, but in 1850 only English coal—two-thirds cannel coal and one-third Newcastle. In 1850 there were sixty miles of main pipes and two thousand public lamps, all south of Canal and Grand streets. In 1830 the Manhattan Gas Company was chartered. In 1850 the length of pipe was one hundred and twelve miles, supplying three

thousand, one hundred and four dwellings, two thousand, seven hundred and eighteen stores and shops, eight hundred and twenty-five churches, nine markets, ten police stations and one Metropolitan Hall, one hundred and eighty-seven public houses, and four thousand, five hundred and fifty street lamps.

The water supply was for three-quarters of a century the most difficult problem New York had to settle. But for the foresight and perhaps for the delay, we should not today have that one essential condition of a large population, an abundance of pure water. Before the Revolution the supply was from a reservoir on the line of Broadway, to which water was pumped from wells. In 1812 the Manhattan Company obtained a charter from the state, raised the water, and distributed it to the lower parts of the city. Our older people have seen its wooden pipes now and then dug up. The bulk of the population till after 1840 depended on their own or the public pumps. Fortunately there was a great abundance of fresh springs. Many of the pumps were in the middle of the roadway; they were later ordered to the sidewalks by a city ordinance. For many years Samuel Stevens, alderman of the third ward in the times when it was an honor to be an alderman, urged bringing water from the Bronx. In 1835 the citizens, by a popular vote of 17,330 to 5,963, declared in favor of the Croton supply and construction of an aqueduct across the Harlem. In 1842 the commissioners opened the communication, coming through the aqueduct in a small boat from the Croton to the Fifth Avenue Reservoir. A tablet with their names marked the event. It was taken down recently, when the reservoir was demolished, and is now preserved in the collections of the New York Historical Society. In 1850 the daily current was thirty millions of gallons, which for a population of four hundred and thirty thousand only gave twenty gallons each. London, with a population of two millions, used in that year fifty million gallons only. Two mains of thirty-

six miles' limited the supply, but the commissioners then reported that the reserve on the Croton was adequate to supply any city on the globe.

There was still another subject which much exercised the spirits and taxed the souls of the men of the first half of the century, a vexation that long survived them. This was the sewage system. The form of Manhattan Island, Mr. King tells us, is that of a turtle-back sloping from the center to each side and naturally shedding the water. At Union Square and Trinity Church the water level is forty-five feet above tide water. The first sewer in the city of any extent was that in Canal Street, but there were no air-traps, and in consequence there were abundant bad odors. The open sewers at the foots of the streets on the river line hard by the markets, which no doubt had been the cause of the spread of the yellow fever, were now closed. Although the introduction of the Croton made a great difference in the cleanliness and health of the city, and especially in that part given up to residences, the condition of New York could fairly compare with that of London or Paris at that period. But we were yet primitive in many things. The pigs still had right of way on our thoroughfares. I well remember seeing a woman thrown down by two of these animals on the corner of Broadway and Canal in 1843 on my return home on a vacation from Harvard. The date is fixed in my mind because of my mortification, being accompanied by a New England classmate, to whom I had boasted of our superior civilization.

There was in 1830 a theatre on the site of Christ Church in Anthony Street, where the elder Kean made his first appearance on the stage. The old Park Theatre, twice burned, was an echo of the past. The changes in the centers of business and residence were constant. Pine Street till 1815 was occupied by the merchants and lawyers. Of these latter, Thomas Addis Emmett and Samuel Jones, David B. Ogden, the Radcliffs, Oliver Wolcott, and Jona-

than Burrall lived there. A returned traveller complained of the height of the buildings as prejudicial to health in the narrow streets, shutting out light and air. What would he say to-day to see the thousands of clerks employed in these localities working for hours by electric light, never enjoying one breath of sunlit atmosphere? Such neglect of the ordinary laws of hygiene would not be allowed in any public institution, yet the very men who give millions in private charity condemn their clerks to this factitious existence.

In 1850 there was not a private dwelling left in Pine Street, or between Pearl and Broadway a single building which stood there in 1815. Up to 1835 the drygoods jobbers were to be found on Broadway and Beaver, the auction houses on Hanover Square, Broad and Beaver, and on Broadway from the Battery to Chambers Street. And here I may add that the establishment of the southern line of steamships in 1846, which had their wharves in the North River section, attracted to the side streets below the Park all sorts of that trade which sought outlets by them to Charleston and Savannah. Such was the rush to secure freight on these vessels that the drays often waited all night with their loads. Nearness to them was almost a necessity of the trade.

Benjamin Franklin, in a letter written before the Revolution, said: "There never was a good war or a bad peace"—a saying which must certainly be taken with limitations, and assuredly until justice becomes the normal condition of human affairs war will continue to be the resort of the oppressed. Each of the quarters of the century has been marked by a war. That of the second quarter had less excuse than any that preceded or succeeded it. It has been termed the "only blot on our national escutcheon." Yet those who hold that the course of events is mainly independent of human control and that what is termed progress is but a present evolution of past causes, can today see

that the war with Mexico, like the late war with Spain, might have been postponed but not avoided. Two civilizations were face to face on the Texan border. Two systems of government confronted each other, which could never be neighborly—the one republican, the other autocratic. The contention of the United States was the same that determined the purchase of Louisiana and the cession of Florida—America for Americans. In the end no doubt the war was hastened by the aggressions on our borders. Wars usually have their beginnings thus, but their causes lie behind. Certain it is that had not the Mexican War taken place before, it would have inevitably followed the discovery of gold in California. Texas, with its large colony from the United States, declared itself independent of Mexico. Mexico acknowledged that independence on condition that Texas should not join the United States. Besides the question of annexation there was one of boundary. Polk's administration saw opportunity in the dispute and declared war in 1845. United States troops took possession of the disputed territory, and California early fell an easy prey. The city of Mexico was captured in September, 1847, and a treaty of peace was signed in February, 1848, which secured California and New Mexico for a money consideration. It seems an outcome of manifest destiny indeed that the discovery of gold should have been made before another twelve months had passed. New York State had her full share of troops in the struggle, and her honor was held high by the achievements of her sons. General Worth, an obelisk to whose memory stands at the angle of Broadway and Fifth Avenue, was the hero of Monterey. General Wool was breveted for his services at Buena Vista, and New York's own son, Phil Kearney, was first through the gates of Mexico. This was an exciting period in New York. The incidents of the struggle were of thrilling interest—a story of long anxieties, of sudden dangers, and of indomitable courage. Hardly had New York passed the

excitements of our own war than her sympathies were aroused to fever heat by the struggles in Europe, the flight of King Louis Philippe from France, and of William of Prussia from Berlin, and the brave effort of Hungary to free herself from Austrian rule, an effort in which she would have proved victorious but for the intervention of Russia. Kossuth, the hero of the contest, arrived in New York with his brave suite on his mission to entreat the aid of the United States. He was received here with a grand military parade, and the entire period of his stay was a continued ovation. His own address at Irving Hall was a marvellous piece of oratory, showing a mastery of the English tongue and a rare knowledge of its resources. But though his appeal reached deep into the hearts of the people, the government was not to be tempted from its old-time policy of non-interference in foreign affairs. The humiliation of Austria by Prussia at Sadowa redressed these wrongs of the Hungarians, and today perhaps they are reconciled to their defeat.

The closing event of this first half of the century, however, was the rush from Europe as well as America to the new Eldorado, the Golden Gate of the Pacific. In New York the excitement affected all classes, and the one desire in the winter of 1849-50 was to reach California. In that rough winter, when the snow stood so high in Broadway that when piled up to make way for vehicles, only the hats of the passers on one side of the street could be seen from the other, the craze which seized our population was almost incredible. Vessel after vessel left our wharves, laden to the very guards for the passage around the Horn; young gentlemen of the highest social standing, students from college, were caught with the madness of the hour. Many of the overladen ships were wrecked on their way, or arrived at San Francisco after long delays, when their passengers found their only choice was between hard labor and starvation. Gentlemen from our best clubs for a while

became porters, carried trunks, engaged as waiters, did anything for board and lodging. Many returned home, but many remained, and the memory of the forty-niners from New York is still cherished on the Pacific slope.

In 1835 the second great fire in the history of the city destroyed a large section of the lower part of the city, extending from the river front on South Street and reaching to the west side of Wall Street. Six hundred and seventy-four houses were destroyed, and a value of seventeen millions. The cold was so great that the water froze in the hose of the fire engines. Among the buildings was the old Merchants' Exchange, with its art treasure, Clevenger's fine statue of Hamilton. The first great fire was that of 1776, when old Trinity was destroyed; and yet a third in 1845 added to the calamities of the first half of the century. In this three hundred and forty-five buildings were consumed on an area reaching from Whitehall Street to Exchange Place.

In 1840 occurred the famous "hard cider and log cabin campaign" for the presidency, resulting in the election of General Harrison ("Old Tippecanoe"), of which log cabins on Broadway were a strange feature.

It was intended to give some notice of the progress of the arts, the drama, and the opera in this paper. Space forbids; but the reader is referred to the fourth of the great addresses to which allusion has been made. This address has been extended into a volume. It contains the reminiscences of that genial old antiquary and typical New Yorker, the late Dr. John Wakefield Francis.

In 1824 the official value of real and personal property in the city was \$83,075,676; in 1835, \$218,723,703; in 1850, realty, \$207,142,576; personal, \$78,919,240. The advance in state valuations was no less remarkable. In 1851 it was four times that of 1824—an advance mainly due to the improvement in land and water communication. The United States census for 1850 reports the number of manufactories

in the city as 3,389, employing 83,620 persons, and a capital of \$34,232,822, with an output of \$105,218,308. The number of buildings in the city in 1850 by the census was 37,677 dwellings, with 515,547 inhabitants. As yet no distinctions were reported as to nativity.

THE FAMILY LINE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON.

BY JOEL N. ENO, A. M.

THE family history of George Washington, first president of the United States, has engaged the attention of several careful and competent genealogical students. Condensed mainly from Thornton A. Washington, a descendant of George Washington's brother, and as to the remoter origin of the family from Henry Whitman, who has recently made a personal eyewitness search through the old country seats of the Washington Family, we draw the following direct line:

I

Torfin, living in Yorkshire in the time of Edward the Confessor.

II

Bardulf, brother and heir to Bodin, recorded in the Domesday Book of William the Conqueror as lord of Ravensworth, about four miles north of Richmond in Yorkshire.

III

Akary, son of Bardulf; lord of Ravenworth under Henry I. and Stephen.

IV

Bonde, lord of Washington-juxta-Ravensworth (now Whashton), in the time of Stephen (1135-54).

V

Walter de Washington, seized of divers manors in Northumberland and Westmoreland, by right of his wife Agnes, daughter of Ivo of Millburne, county of Westmoreland.

VI

Robert de Washington, seized of divers lands in Strikland Ketell in Westmoreland, by marriage with Johanna, daughter of Walter Strikland.

VII

Robert de Washington, seized of a messuage and lands in Kernford (Carnforth), County Lancashire, by right of his wife Amicia, daughter of Hugh de Kernford.

VIII

Robert Washington of Kernford, pardoned by Edward II. for aiding the Duke of Lancaster against Edward I. Married Agnes, of Warton-in-Lonsdale, County Lancaster, 1352.

IX

John Washington. Married Alienora, daughter of John de Warton.

X

John Washington. Married Johanna—1386.

XI

John Washington, wounded at the battle of Agincourt, France, 1415.

XII

Robert Washington of Warton, living 1476.

XIII

Robert Washington of Tuwhitfield (Whitfield) County Lancaster.

XIV

John Washington of Tuwhitfield.

XV

John Washington of Warton. Married Margaret, daughter of Robert Kitson of Warton.

XVI

Laurence Washington. Married Anne (or Amy), daughter of Robert Pargiter of Gretworth, and was once mayor of Northampton.

XVII

Robert Washington. Married Elizabeth Light of Radway, County Warwick.

XVIII

Laurence Washington of Northampton. Married Margaret, daughter of William Butler of Tighes, Sussex.

XIX.

Laurence Washington, rector of Purleigh in Essex. Married Amphilis Roades.

XX

John Washington, who emigrated by way of Yorkshire to Virginia, 1658, and settled at Bridge's Creek, Westmoreland County. Married Anne Pope, thought to be descended from or related to George Pope, an Englishman recorded as "living in Jam(e)s Island," February 16, 1623.

XXI

Lawrence Washington, born 1661. Married Mildred, daughter of Colonel Augustine Warner of Gloucester County, Va., of an old English family, and descended on his mother's side from the Reades and Windebanks of Hampshire, England. Colonel Warner's mother's father, Colonel George Reade, emigrated from Linkenholt in Hampshire to Gloucester County, Va., about 1637; married Elizabeth, daughter of Nicholas Martian, a denizen of England, but believed of French birth (who emigrated to Virginia before 1620). Colonel Reade was descended from Sir Edward Dymoke, king's champion of England at the coronations of Edward VI. and Queens Mary and Elizabeth—Sir Edward in turn, through Thomas of Brotherton, Earl of Norfolk, being descended from Edward I., Plantagenet, King of England, and in other lines from the famous Marmion, Percy, Neville, and de Burgh noble houses. (For the origin of this family and the office of champion, in brief, see my article, "The Dymokes," in the *Connecticut Magazine*, last number of 1905).

XXII

Augustine Washington, born 1694. Married, 1st, Jane Butler; 2d, in 1731, Mary, daughter of Joseph Ball, born in Yorkshire, 1649, (the son of William Ball, who emigrated from England to Virginia about 1650) and widow Mary Johnston (or Johnson), who was supposed to be a descendant of Peter and Eleanor (Allen) Montague of Boveney, parish of Burnham, in Buckinghamshire, recorded as living in 1624 "on the plantation of Captain Sam. Matthews at James City, Va." The daughter of Mrs. Ball's half-sister, however, testified that Mrs. Ball was born in England.

XXIII

Issue of Augustine Washington by his first wife, Jane Butler:

1. Butler Washington, born 1716, died young.
2. Lawrence Washington, born 1718.
3. Augustine Washington, born 1720.
4. Jane Washington, born 1722, died 1735.

Issue of Augustine Washington by his second wife, Mary Ball:

5. *George Washington*, born February (11, old style) 22 (new style), 1732.
6. Betty Washington, born January 20, 1733.
7. Samuel Washington, born November 16, 1734.
8. John Augustine Washington, born January 13, 1736.
9. Charles Washington, born May 2, 1738.
10. Mildred Washington, born 1739, died 1740.

Augustine Washington (XXII.), the father, died April 12, 1743, leaving his widow and children well provided for. He owned several plantations (the home being near Fredericksburg), and left to each son valuable land and securities.

Lawrence Washington received the plantation later called "Mount Vernon," and dying in 1752 bequeathed it first to his daughter, an only child, and in the event of her death to his brother, George. The daughter died not long after her father.

At fourteen George Washington obtained a midshipman's warrant, but gave up going to sea because his mother was opposed to it. He received a limited private education, which, however, included surveying and a little French; but thrived physically, becoming six feet two inches tall in his stockings. He was much employed as surveyor by Lord Fairfax, an English nobleman who lived in Virginia, and owned a great deal of new land in the Shenandoah Valley. In 1759, at the age of twenty-seven, Washington married Martha, the widow of Daniel Parke Custis, who left her "The White House," (the name of which was afterward transferred to the president's house at Wash-

ington), with a plantation of about eight thousand acres near White House Landing, Va. Mrs. Custis-Washington had by her first husband two children, John Parke Custis and Martha Parke Custis, who at the time of Washington's marriage were respectively six and four years old. Washington had no children, but at the death of John Parke Custis at the end of the Revolution adopted his wife's grandchildren, Eleanor Parke Custis and George Washington Parke Custis.

Old Virginia was the purest American representative of the English upper classes, the Cavalier element, and the Church of England. As Bishop William Meade says in his "Old Virginia Families," "The old English aristocracy is apparent on the vestry books;" and the purity of blood is acknowledged by all. Meade, vol. ii., p. 429, says: "Very few Scotch and Irish names are found in this list [of old and leading families], but the great bulk of them are English or British." The "Proceedings of the Scotch-Irish Society" says that Virginia "from the coast to the Blue Ridge was pure English." The "Proceedings of the American-Irish Historical Society" says, vol. ii., p. 63: "Virginia undoubtedly was first settled by the English." Washington, therefore, as master of a plantation, was but enacting the role of his ancestors for six centuries back—that of an English country gentleman; and like them, for some time back, was a churchman.

THE MORRIS FAMILY OF MORRISANIA.

BY W. W. SPOONER.

(Continued from p. 267.)

V.

Line of Lewis Morris the Signer (IV.)

LEWIS MORRIS, eldest son of Lewis Morris the Signer, was born at Morrisania in 1752. He was graduated from Princeton College in 1774, entered the revolutionary army, and, becoming aide to General John Sullivan with the rank of major, served with him throughout his Indian campaign. Subsequently he was a member of the staff of General Nathaniel Greene, under whom he served with great credit in the Carolinas, receiving the thanks of congress and promotion to a coloneley. He lived in Charleston, S. C.

Died November 22, 1824. A monument to his memory stands in St. Michael's churchyard, Charleston.

Married Anne Elliott, of a Charleston family; she was born 1752, died April 20, 1848. Living in Charleston when it was occupied by the British, she wore a bonnet decorated with thirteen small plumes as a token of her attachment to republican principles. She was called "the beautiful rebel."

Issue:

Jacob Morris. He was twice married, his second wife being Caroline de Salienne.

George Morris. M. Maria Whaley. Issue:

George Morris, a lieutenant in the navy, who married and lived in Virginia.

Josephine Morris. M. Colonel Peter A. Porter of Niagara.

They had a son, George Porter, and a daughter, who d. young.

Sabina Morris.

Louisa Morris.

Captain William Morris. M. Anne Fishborne. Issue:

i. Emma Morris, b. November 10, 1821, d. January 16, 1844.

ii. Anna Morris, b. January 1, 1821, d. December 21, 1864.

M. Martin R. Zborowski (who d. December 8, 1878). He was of the American family of Zabriskie; purchased a principality in Poland which belonged to his Zborowski ancestors. Issue: 1. John Zborowski, d. unmarried. 2. Anna Zborowski, m. Count Charles de Montsaulnin of Fontenay, France (their children being Madeline de Montsaulnin, m. Comte Roland de Louart [three sons] and Marguerite de Montsaulnin, m. Vicomte Herve de Gourcuff [three sons]). 3. Alister Zborowski, d. young. 4. William Elliott Zborowski, a famous cross-country rider, who was killed in an automobile accident at Nice, France; m. Mme. de Steuers (*nee* Margaret L. Carey), and left one son.

iii. Julia Morris. M. William Stebbins.

Colonel Lewis Morris; of whom below.

Ann Morris. M. Elias Van der Horst of Charleston, S. C.; issue.

Mary Walton Morris, d. September 23, 1876. M. General W. C. Wayne of South Carolina.

Sabina Morris, d. March 7, 1857. M. Robert Walter Rutherford, who d. April 24, 1852; issue.

GENERAL JACOB MORRIS, second son of Lewis Morris the Signer, was born at Morrisania, December 28, 1755. It was his father's desire that he should pursue a mercantile career, and he was educated to that end, but joined the army in the Revolution and was aide to General Charles Lee (under whom he fought with distinction at Fort Moultrie and elsewhere) and also to General Nathaniel Greene. After the war he served in both the assembly and senate of the New York legislature. He had the rank of general of militia.

As partial compensation to his father, Lewis Morris the Signer, and uncle, Judge Richard Morris, for losses sustained by them in the Revolution, the state of New York granted them a tract of thirty thousand acres in what was then Montgomery County, N. Y. Thither General Jacob

Morris removed in 1787, and became the pioneer in the development of that region.

Died at Butternuts (now Morris), Otsego County, N. Y., January 10, 1844.

Married, 1st, Mary Cox, daughter of Isaac Cox.

Issue:

1. *Lewis Lee Morris*; of whom below.

2. John Cox Morris, b. in Philadelphia, 1781. He was educated at Dartmouth College, subsequently studying law and being admitted to the bar. He successfully practiced his profession in Otsego County, N. Y., and served as judge. Unmarried.

3. Richard Morris, b. in Philadelphia, 1782, and removed with his parents to the present Otsego County. M. Frances Upton and resided at "Upton Park."

Mary Ann Morris, b. 1784. M. Isaac Cooper of Cooperstown.

5. George Morris, d. young.

6. Sarah Sabina Morris, b. 1788. M., 1st, Peter Kean; 2d, Looe Baker. In the Kean line are descended the present United States Senator John Kean of New Jersey (son of John and Lucy [Halsted] Kean); Julia, Mrs. Hamilton Fish, and Christine, Mrs. William Preston Griffin, who was actively engaged with the sanitary commission at the front during the Civil War.

7. Susan Morris; d. young.

8. Jacob Walton Morris, b. at Butternuts, Otsego County, N. Y., 1792; left issue a son, Charles Morris.

9. Catharine Cox Morris, b. at Butternuts, 1794. M. John Holmes Prentiss of Cooperstown.

10. William Augustus Morris, b. 1796, accidentally killed 1818. M. Jane Morris.

11. James Morris, d. young.

12. Charles Valentine Morris, b. 1802; entered the navy as midshipman at the age of fourteen, and continued in that service until retired for age; during the Civil War was commandant at the Washington Navy Yard; after his retirement lived at Sackett's Harbor, N. Y.

General Jacob Morris married, 2d, Sophia Pringle.

Issue:

13. William Augustus Pringle Morris. M. Harriet Grannis.

WILLIAM WALTON MORRIS, third son of Lewis Morris the Signer, was born at Morrisania in 1760. In the Revolution he was lieutenant of the Second Artillery, contin-

ental line, also serving on the staff of General Anthony Wayne, and, with his two older brothers, received the thanks of congress. He was a charter member of the Society of the Cincinnati.

Died April 5, 1832.

Married Sarah Carpenter.

Issue:

1. Lewis Morris. M. Julia Hayes.
2. *General William Walton Morris*; of whom below.
3. Lieutenant-Colonel Gouverneur Morris. M. Anna Maria de Camp. One son, Gouverneur William Morris, b. March 1, 1855, d. February 2, 1896.
4. James Morris.
5. Sarah Caroline Morris, d. unmarried.
6. Maria Frederica Morris, d. unmarried.
7. Frances Morris. M., 1st, Captain David Brooks, U. S. A.; 2d, Abraham Shepard. Issue by first marriage: i. Fanny Brooks, m. William Walton and d. without issue. ii. Isabella Brooks, m. Walter Rutherford, and had four sons and one daughter.
8. Anne Morris. M. Aquila G. Stout. Issue: i. Sarah Morris Stout, m. Baron Ancelis de Vaugrigneuse of the French embassy in Washington, and d. without issue. ii. Francis Aquila Stout, m. Emily Meredith Read; no issue.
9. Arthur Breeze Morris. M. Mary Bard; no issue.

JAMES MORRIS, fourth son of Lewis Morris the Signer and Mary (Walton) Morris, was born at Morrisania in 1764. His youth was spent in England under the care of his uncle, General Staats Long Morris, and he was educated at Eton. Upon his return to the United States he entered the law office of Aaron Burr, and later was admitted to the bar. He held the office of high sheriff of New York County, by appointment from Governor Jay. Removing from the city to Morrisania, he acquired a large estate there, and was a citizen of influence and the highest personal reputation. The Westchester County Agricultural Society owed its organization to his efforts.

Died at Morrisania, September 7, 1827.

Married, February 1, 1796, Helen Van Cortlandt, daugh-

ter of Augustus and Helen (Barclay) Van Cortlandt of Yonkers.

Issue:

1. James Van Cortlandt Morris. M. Catherine Post, daughter of James Wright Post, M. D., of New York City, and had a son, James Morris, who d. unmarried.
2. Frederick Augustus Morris. He took the name Van Cortlandt, to succeed to his grandfather's estate. M., 1st, Harriet Munro, daughter of Peter Jay Munro. Issue: i. Augustus Van Cortlandt, a physician, who d. in 1885 unmarried. ii. Peter Jay Munro Van Cortlandt, m. Ann M. Hunter; no issue. iii. Daughter, who d. young.—Frederick Augustus Morris Van Cortlandt m., 2d, Jane Catherine Maitland; no issue.
3. Catharine Morris. M. Dr. Alexander H. Stevens of New York. Issue: Alexa Stevens, and two other daughters, who d. young. Alexa Stevens m. Rev. James J. Bowden—their issue being Constance Bowden, m. Herbert Washington, and has a son, Bowden Washington; and James Bowden, d. young.
4. Mary Walton Morris, d. unmarried.
5. Helen Morris. M. Richard R. Morris, son of Colonel Lewis Morris (V.) and grandson of Lewis Morris the Signer. Issue: i. Helen Morris. ii. Lewis Morris. iii. Anna Elliott Morris, m., as his second wife, the second Gouverneur Morris, son of the statesman, and d. without children in 1884. iv. Mary W. Morris. v. Sophia Morris, m. Charles D. Burrill of New York City (their children being Brayton Burrill [m. Elizabeth Steward; two children], Mary Burrill [m. Richard L. Kemble; two sons], and Percy Burrill).
6. Ann Morris, d. unmarried.
7. Jane Morris, d. unmarried.
8. *Dr. Richard Lewis Morris*; of whom below.
9. Robert Rutherford Morris, lived at New Rochelle, N. Y.
- M. Hannah Edgar, daughter of William Edgar. Issue:
 - i. Catherine Morris. M. Henry Delafield Phelps; four children.
 - ii. Annie Morris, d. unmarried.
 - iii. William Edgar Morris, d. unmarried.
 - iv. Cornelia Leroy Morris, d. unmarried.
 - v. Helen Morris. M. Dr. Magill of the United States army; no issue.
10. Sarah Louisa Morris. M. Edward Augustus LeRoy of Avon, Genesee County, N. Y. Issue: i. Helen V. C. LeRoy, m. William Pinckney Stewart (their children being Louisa Morris Stewart, m. James Kent, a grandson of the chancellor; Helen Van Cortlandt Stewart, m. William Irving Kent; Edward LeRoy Stewart, and Charlotte Pinckney Stewart).

11. *William Henry Morris*; of whom below.

12. Charlotte Morris. M. Richard Kemble. Issue: Mary Kemble.

RICHARD VALENTINE MORRIS, sixth and youngest son of Lewis Morris the Signer and Mary (Walton) Morris, was born at Morrisania, March 8, 1768. He was appointed a captain in the United States navy in 1798, and was commander of the Mediterranean Squadron, dispatched against the pirates of the Barbary States, in 1802.

Married, January 24, 1797, Anne Walton, daughter of Jacob and Mary (Cruger) Walton. She died April 18, 1858.

[Her father, Jacob Walton, was a son of Jacob and Maria (Beekman) Walton; her mother, Mary Cruger, was a daughter of Henry Cruger, Sr.]

Issue:

1. Lewis Morris, d. young.

2. Gerard Walton Morris, b. July 11, 1799; was graduated from Columbia College in 1818, and was for many years one of the leading lawyers of New York; he d. July 19, 1869. M. Martha Pine. Issue: Gerard W. Morris, Isabella Morris, Anne Walton Morris, Richard B. Morris, Captain John P. Morris of the United States army, Henry W. Morris (who attained the highest honors in the Masonic order), Rev. Arthur Rutherford Morris, Honoria Morris (m. Francis J. Barretto and d. in 1866, one son being now living, Gerard M. Barretto), Mary Pine Morris (m. Jonathan Edwards and d. in 1857, one child being now living, Mary Morris Edwards, who m. [October 11, 1887] Charles F. Ostrander and has one child, Mary Morris Ostrander).

3. Richard Valentine Morris, d. unmarried, October 9, 1843.

4. *Henry Morris*; of whom below.

Line of Chief-Justice Richard Morris (IV.)

ROBERT MORRIS, second son of Chief-Justice Richard and Sarah (Ludlow) Morris, was born June 28, 1762. He inherited the fine estate of Mount Fordham, in Westchester County, N. Y., and was a successful merchant in New York City. For a time he was resident at Claverack, Columbia County, N. Y.

Died at Mount Fordham, February 22, 1851.

Married, March 11, 1786, Frances Ludlum, daughter of Isaac Ludlum of Goshen, N. Y.

Issue:

1. Mary Morris, d. young.
2. Julia Sarah Morris, b. September 13, 1788, d. January 16, 1874. M. William B. Ludlow; twelve children.
3. Mary Morris, b. December 25, 1790, d. May 24, 1869. M. James A. Hamilton, son of Alexander Hamilton the statesman; five children.
4. Daughter, d. young.
5. Richard Robert Morris, b. April 22, 1794, d. November 22, 1874. M. Martha Lynn Taylor; six children.
6. James L. Morris, b. August 10, 1796, d. January 23, 1878. M. Lucretia Crary, daughter of Peter Crary; seven children.
7. Frances W. Morris, b. March 24, 1799, d. May 5, 1868. M. Thomas W. Ludlow; no issue.
8. Daughter, d. young.
9. Robert Hunter Morris, b. in New York City, February 15, 1802, d. October 24, 1855. He was reared and educated in Columbia County, N. Y., admitted to the bar, and was a successful practitioner; served at various times as member of assembly, recorder of New York City, mayor of New York City for three consecutive terms (1841-3), postmaster of New York City, and member of the constitutional convention of 1846. It was under his mayoralty that the modern police force of the metropolis was established. M. Ann Eliza Monson; no issue.
10. William Lewis Morris, b. June 13, 1804, d. April 26, 1864. M. Mary E. Babcock; seven children. His second son, Robert Morris, was b. in New York in 1838, graduated at Yale in 1858, and studied law. After the firing on Sumter he enlisted in the army, serving with credit in the Civil War. He removed to San Francisco, where he d. November 15, 1901.
11. *Lewis Gouverneur Morris*; of whom below.

Line of Gouverneur Morris (IV.)

GOUVERNEUR MORRIS, 2d, only son of Hon. Gouverneur and Ann (Randolph) Morris, was born at Old Morrisania, February 9, 1813. Throughout his life he took an active interest in the development of the internal resources of the United States. He was a prominent citizen of Morrisania, and was the donor of the land for St. Ann's (Epis-

copal) Church in that locality, also furnishing practically the entire amount required for the construction of the edifice.

Died at Pelham, N. Y., August 20, 1888.

Married, 1st, January 10, 1842, his cousin on the maternal side, Patsey Jefferson Cary of Virginia.

Issue:

Gouverneur Morris, 3d; of whom below.

Anne Cary Morris, author of the "Diary and Letters of Gouverneur Morris." M. Alfred P. Mandslay of London, England, a noted authority and writer on Central American antiquities; no issue.

Mary Fairfax Morris. M. J. Alfred Davenport (deceased), a well-known lawyer of New York. Issue: Beatrix Cary Davenport and Hetty Gouverneur Davenport.

P. Randolph Morris, d. young.

P. Randolph Morris, resides in Colorado; has taken an active part in politics in that state, and has large property interests there. M., July 14, 1906, Louisa Hughes, daughter of Andrew S. Hughes of Denver.

Margaret Rutherford Morris. M. Lewis E. V. Turner of London, England, who d. 1900; no issue.

Virginia Cary Morris.

Orlando Fairfax Morris.

Powhatan Morris.

Gouverneur Morris, 2d, married, 2d, June 8, 1876, Anna Morris, daughter of Richard R. and Helen (Morris) Morris, and great-granddaughter of Lewis Morris the Signer. No issue.

(*To be continued.*)

THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION.

BY HORACE S. LYMAN.

IT has been said of the Lewis and Clark expedition: "The continental divide was surmounted in three different places, many miles apart. The actual travel by land and water, including various side trips, amounted to about one-third the circumference of the globe. This was done with the cost of one life, and without another serious casualty, though often with great hardship, sometimes much suffering, and occasional imminent peril. . . . The story of this adventure stands easily first and alone. This is our national epic of exploration."

Another specialist¹ in Oregon history has said: "While our title to the Oregon region was in question and our claim to the Pacific northwest was disputed by England, it was customary to name the Lewis and Clark expedition as one of four or five links in the chain of our right. The list comprised generally the following: The discovery of the Columbia River by Robert Gray; the Lewis and Clark expedition; the founding of Astoria; the restitution of Astoria in 1818, involving an acknowledgment of our possession of the region; the transfer to us of the rights of Spain in the treaty of 1819. But were these events equally and independently decisive? The naval battle in Manila Bay is recognized by all as the decisive event leading to our possession of the Philippines. . . . Much the same relation did the Lewis and Clark expedition bear to the subsequent events that furnished the basis of our claim to

¹F. G. Young.

Oregon. . . . This can be claimed for the Lewis and Clark exploration rather than for Gray's discovery."

As a matter of fact, selection of the most decisive event, or the most influential character, in Oregon history is much like trying to determine which of the stones in an arch is most important, where each is necessary; or whether at the root, in the boll, or in the branch the flow of sap for the tree is pre-eminently important. The more one examines the history of Oregon in its entirety the more does he become impressed that all that happened was necessary to the outcome as we have it, and that all the events and characters were singularly dependent one upon another, making a beautiful organic growth. Upon whichever one the thought is concentrated, the relation to the whole is seen to extend both before and behind, and to include the most, if not all, that happened, and thus seems perhaps the first and chief; but observation of almost any other in the same light reveals the same connection and beauty of correspondence. However, if any one event can be singled out as the most important and distinctive, and embodying the most of hope and promise, it may be the expedition of Lewis and Clark.

This was Jefferson's personal conception, nourished for twenty years, and carried out to his intent, and in his spirit. Although when harassed Jefferson was capable of accepting conflict, strife was wholly against his grain. His nature was for gentleness and peace, and he determined from the first that the proposed journey should be one of amity, and that the Indian tribes should be treated in the most friendly manner by the explorers. He was very particular on this point, and was careful in his instructions to give no hint of a contemptuous or overbearing spirit. He does not refer to the native tribes that would be met as "savages," or as "barbarians," or even as Indians; but as "people," or "nations." After naming in detail some of the proposals useful to promotion of trade and commerce, he touches upon

the higher humanitarian objects, concluding: "And considering the interest which every nation has in extending the authority of reason and justice among the people around them, it will be useful to acquire what knowledge you can of the state of morality, religion, and information among them; as it may better enable those who may endeavor to civilize and instruct them to adapt their measures to the existing notions and practices of those among whom they are to operate"—thus foreshadowing not only the many humanitarian efforts actually made since that day among the Indians by benevolent individuals, but a policy of civilization and education that our government itself has, at rather a late day, adopted.

As to particular treatment of the Indians, he says: "In all your intercourse with the natives treat them in the most friendly and conciliatory manner which their own conduct will admit; allay all jealousies as to the object of your journey; satisfy them of its innocence; make them acquainted with the extent, character, peaceable, and commercial disposition of the United States, of our wish to be neighborly, friendly, and useful to them, and of our disposition to a commercial intercourse with them." He enlarges upon this to the extent of making personal friends of the chiefs, indicating the method that has in all the subsequent history with Indians been found very effective in making them peaceable, saying: "If a few of the influential chiefs within practical distance wish to visit us, arrange such a visit"—that is, at Washington. He also suggests education of their young men: "If any of them should wish to have some of their people brought up with us, and taught such arts as may be useful to them, we will receive, instruct, and take care of them." While these directions and suggestions may be considered as largely in the interest of policy, as it would have been most idle to think of conducting an expedition across the continent in a manner hostile to the natives,

forcing their way with fire and sword, it is also reasonably certain that Jefferson was indulging his feelings of good will, and was glad to think that these coincided with wise policy. It must also be noticed that only the benevolent ever regard benevolence, and regard for the rights and feelings of others, as either wise or politic; the harsh and cruel, of whom the world has had so many examples that the Lewis and Clark expedition stands out as a grand exception, know of no procedure except according to their own nature. That Jefferson, however, felt keen interest in the welfare of the Indians themselves is indicated in his careful proposition that some of the "matter of the kine pox" be taken and the Indians be instructed in the advantages of vaccination—a startling antithesis to those who look upon the dark-skinned races as doomed, and that survival of the fittest requires their speedy extinction, either by war or disease.

The medallion medals that were struck as presents to the greater Indian chiefs bore the legend "Peace and Friendship," and hands clasped. This spirit is worthy of notice, as it was carried out to the letter, or rather in its full spirit, and to this was due the perfect success of the exploration. It was wisely seen by the president that the most effective way of gaining the co-operation of the natives was by mutual good will and respect; and he was correct in believing that these feelings were as controlling among the uncivilized tribes as among the whites.

He was very fortunate in the selection of his agents; both the captains at the head of the expedition carried out his intentions as carefully as had Monroe at Paris. Practically both Lewis and Clark were equal in rank, and acted as comrades; though technically the former outranked the latter.

Lewis was a Virginian, "of distinguished Scotch ancestry," born in 1774. Although but thirty years old when he assumed command of this exploring party, he had

already attained eminence. As a boy he studied Latin and hunted 'possums after dark in the woods of the Old Dominion, and developed great strength, or endurance, of body, as well as courage, presence of mind, and capacity for roughing it in all sorts of conditions. When offering his services to conduct an exploration alone from Kentucky to "the South Sea," he declared that he could travel and live wherever an Indian could. The story is told that when but a boy of nine at Charlottesville, Va., a camp of women and children were surprised at the evening fire by an arrow shot among them; Lewis at once, amid the fright and hubbub, seized a bucket of water and put out the fire, to prevent the camp being seen, and fired off guns which scattered the enemy. Later he entered the army, and at length became private secretary of President Jefferson, who seems to have entertained the highest regard for him. Lewis was certainly not a learned man, though after his appointment to the position he spent some months in hard study to acquire knowledge of taking astronomical observations, and something of natural history. He was a man of considerable sentiment, and occasionally attempted fine description of remarkable scenery; though in this he was much inferior to Ledyard. The most of his writing is prosaic, but exact; he was careful to find and note the details as to the Indians, and these records are still of much value.

William Clark was also a native of Virginia, four years older than Lewis, whom he outranked in the army, and was commander over, but retired in 1796. They were already close friends, and though not technically equals on the expedition were practically so. There were four sergeants, Ordway, Prior, Floyd, and Gass. An interesting journal of the expedition was kept by Gass, among several others, it being the desire of the government that as many as might be should keep a narrative of the exploration; resulting in seven. Colter, the two Field brothers, Shields,

Drewyer, a half-breed, and York, Clark's colored servant, were among the useful members of the non-commissioned. York was of especial interest to the Indians both on account of his color and his enormous strength.

Another member of the party, though not acquired until some time after the expedition started, was an Indian woman, who is more likely to live in history, or romance, perhaps, than any of the others. This was Sacajawea, a Shoshone, who was a captive, and was bought as a wife for the Frenchman Chaboneau, and served as guide for the explorers to the borders of her own native land, and becoming known to her brother, when he was finally reached, gave such an account of the friendship of the whites that the Shoshones accorded them almost miraculously good treatment. Sacajawea, it may be mentioned here, accompanied the travelers to the Pacific, being allowed at her special request to go with the party on their exploration to Tillamook Head, and to thus gaze upon the ocean, of which she had heard in the legends of her tribe.

The men selected were volunteers, and seem with but one or two exceptions to have been thoroughly reliable. Arms and ammunition for hunting, and a quantity of goods for distribution among the Indians, such as beads, looking-glasses, paints, flags, knives, and medals, were included among the supplies. The medals seem to have proved of greatest interest, several of the large ones having been found in the graves of Indians, one being from the Nez Percés; and the influence of that little piece of stamped metal can perhaps be traced in its effects upon this, as has been well styled, the royal tribe of American natives. This bore the likeness of the president—the rugged profile of Jefferson himself,—while on the reverse were the clasped hands, the pipe and tomahawk crossed, and the legend "Peace and Friendship."

The season of 1803 was occupied in arranging details, obtaining supplies, enlisting men, and proceeding as far as

Missouri. Not until May 14 of the next year was the season sufficiently advanced to make the real start, that from the well-known Mississippi, up the then little known Missouri. This was to be a journey by water, in boats, as far as possible; though as later experience proved this led to neither the most easy crossing of the mountains nor the shortest time; but was, on the whole, the best for the interests of the expedition and of America. By exploring the Missouri the fur routes were opened, and by descending upon the Columbia a better title to the upper waters was obtained than by the South Pass. The route was practically determined by the mission to the Indians of the upper Missouri in the interest of trade.

In the space allotted here we cannot dwell in full detail upon the great journey. On that day in May, as the big keel boat, with deck and lockers, and the two pirogues, swung out on the yellow waters of the swollen Missouri, and bent their slow course up stream, against swirls and around obstructive points, we can see once more the patient Anglo-Saxon, in his boat, intent on lifting the veil of mystery, and ready to encounter all that may await him in the unknown land beyond; and in this case these two brave American youths, and their party of woodsmen and hunters, were bound on a mission that had deterred already many old world adventurers. There were the immense plains, with buffaloes and Indians; the ever-opposing river, obscure and yellow; the winter in the land of blizzards; then the rising swells of the Rocky Mountains, and finally their stupendous peaks and cruel rock ridges, which cut moccasins and horses' hoofs alike as the lowering sun compelled forced marches before the winter snows began falling. Still more, there was the ever-present possibility of error in route, as they passed beyond the limits of the known, which would compel retracing of difficult paths, and perhaps so consume time as to entangle them beyond their strength in ranges of mountains never before seen.

The mission proposed by the president was faithfully carried out. The Indian tribes were visited, their curiosities observed, and their disposition toward one another and the United States, and peaceful trade, were inquired into. The nearer to the limits of civilization, the worse affected and the worse off the natives were found. The Missouri tribes were fast decaying and their deserted villages only were noticed, while the remnant of the people themselves had moved westward to join the Kansas or Osage Indians. With these people, numbering still some twelve hundred warriors, friendly relations were established, and their stores of corn and pumpkins were liberally drawn upon. We notice with interest that the explorers spent time to learn the myth of the origin of the tribe, which was from a snail, that gradually on a sunny bank ripened into a man, and after receiving his bow and arrow married the daughter of the beaver—that industrious animal being sacred from harm among the tribe until the price of beaver skins at last overbore the scruples of consanguinity. At the entrance of little Manitou Creek also they note the figure of a man carved on the rock, “which may represent some spirit, or deity.”

On the 26th of June the mouth of the Kansas, with its broad bottoms and not a little picturesque bluffs beyond, was passed, and on July 4 a small stream was named “Independence Creek;” while the party was obliged to work its way over bad sand bars, but were pleased to see upon the shore great masses of wild grapevines, giving promise of early fruit, and many wild berries and blooming roses on the shore. From a mound near the mouth of the Nemaha, which members of the party ascended, was seen a great prospect, embracing the lowlands of the Missouri, covered with undulating grasses, now five feet tall; and thence gradually rising into a second plain, where rich weeds and flowers, interspersed with copses of Osage plums, abounded; and grapes nearly ripe were gathered with the

enjoyment of boys on a Saturday picnic. On the 21st, still forcing their way against the turbid Missouri in the boats, which allowed time for the captains to walk along the shore, and the hunters to ramble the hills, and the two horses to stray away at night and be caught up in the morning, the party reached the mouth of the Platte, a broad stream, "the bed of which it fills with moving sands;" and with much difficulty the boat and pirogues were worked around the sand bars formed in the Missouri near the mouth, "and came to above the point, having made fifteen miles." A week later they fell in with some of the scattered and broken bands of the Kite Indians—who seemed always on the wing, hence the name, and who had never given or received quarter, and as a result of too much strenuousness had been now all but annihilated; and also with remnants of the Pawnees and Ottoes. The extraordinarily beautiful contours of the Missouri bottoms were frequently observed on excursions to the bluffs, or hills bordering, and are thus well described: "At a distance varying from four to ten miles, and a height between seventy and three hundred feet, two parallel ranges of highland afford a passage to the Missouri, which enriches the low grounds between them." The captains were thus looking over not only what has since become one of the richest and most populous parts of the United States, but the region from which many of the Oregon settlers took their start across the continent. At one of these picturesque highlands a meeting with the Missouris and Ottoes was arranged, and after many speeches, medals were placed upon the chiefs, and the desire for peace and trade, and general satisfaction with the transfer from France to the United States, was expressed. The place was called Council Bluffs—though not the exact spot now so named.

Much interest was taken as they passed the mound on the river where the great chief, The Black Bird, was buried; and his fate, with that of four hundred of his warriors, from

smallpox, was noticed in sympathetic manner. By the pestilence the tribe was driven to a sort of frenzy; many of the stricken braves, before dying, killed their wives and children also, that they might all go together to the future hunting grounds. These tales were given by Dorion, the interpreter. Here the Americans were able to make peace between warring tribes and interest them in trade with the whites. On the 20th of August the site of Sioux City was reached, and a melancholy interest attaches from the death here of Charles Floyd—a valuable and highly esteemed man. An excursion was taken also, on a day so hot that the dog that accompanied Lewis gave out from heat and had to be sent back, to a singular mound seen at a distance, of such regular formation as to suggest artificial construction; but being found of the same geological formation as the shore bluffs was concluded to be the carving of nature. This mound, like the most of places having some singularity, was invested by the Indians with superstitious terrors—being inhabited by the little people, about eighteen inches tall, with disproportionately large heads, and of an evil disposition, who shot all who approached, having for the purpose murderous little arrows—evidently the same superstition as that of the Klamaths, of the Little Dwarf, or the pygmies who left tiny tracks in the snow. None of these mischievous beings were seen, but the coolness with which the whites entered haunted places proved to the Indians not that the superstition was untrue, but that the whites were of a superior order.

As September came the country of the Sioux was reached, the timber now having all but disappeared, and what was left being of a stunted form. The numerous tribes of the Sioux were found to be friendly at first, but of a treacherous and unreliable disposition. They were a conquering people, having come originally from the country of Winnipeg, and had forced their way west, and had both the greater energy and the greater corruption of a people

that had mingled with the border whites. They had been in contact with the Canadian fur traders, and had learned white men's vices; begging constantly for some "of the Great Father's milk"—or whiskey. They also had ideas of trade, and were finally not well pleased when it was understood that the expedition was to proceed westward; twice they attempted to stop the boat, on the second occasion a number of Indians sitting on the hawser, and refusing to move until the chief was commanded to remove them, and the captains were ready to enforce their command by having guns in readiness for firing. Way was then reluctantly made; but so little pleased were the Americans with their general manner that they seriously thought of uniting the other tribes against the Sioux.

In pleasing contrast they found the disposition of the Aricaras; these were exceedingly friendly, and administered a pretty strong rebuke to the Americans, who, in order to cement the growing amity, offered the chiefs liquor, which the Indians declined with the remark that they "were surprised that the Great Father should present them a liquor that made them fools." They also adverted to the affair again, saying that no man could be "really a friend who would lead them into such folly." They were the less corrupted native Indians, whose tastes and feelings are much more humane than those degraded by the vices of civilization. On another occasion when, according to military law of the time, one of the soldiers was flogged, the Aricara chief showed his humane feeling by crying aloud at the sight: "Among his people," he said, "not even a child was whipped." Punishment by death was sometimes necessary, he admitted; but the degradation of whipping seemed insufferable. It is gratifying to know that since his time flogging has been abolished from both naval and military discipline; our code of civilization having at last reached in this respect the uncorrupted feeling of the savage. The Indians were agriculturists, culti-

vating corn, beans, squashes, watermelons, and a kind of tobacco peculiar to themselves. They were also, like the most of the Indians, myth-makers; a rather plaintive story being told of three rocks, that had been long ago a lover and his sweetheart, but were separated by unwilling parents; the former going to the fields to grieve, and being accompanied by his faithful dog; and the latter being driven by her sorrow to the same spot, where, as an everlasting monument of their faithfulness, lover and dog and sweetheart were changed to stone, to be thus eternally together.

The Aricaras were at war with the Mandans: at a formal meeting of the tribe this was deprecated by the Americans, and it was declared to be the will of the Great Father that all his children should dwell together in peace; that wars should end, and the causes be avoided by all; that they should no longer perish, but increase in numbers. Presents were given the chiefs, and to the tribe as a whole was presented a steel flouring mill, with which they were greatly pleased. The condition of war was found to be chronic; the principal cause being the stealing of slaves, or of horses, or, most offensive of all, of girls. The offended tribe then took up the quarrel until damage equal to that received had been inflicted. But as this could never be agreed upon the feuds continued from generation to generation. A class of young men devoted to avenging wrongs, and supporting the chiefs without question, had arisen; they were sworn, among their other duties, never to turn back from any course once taken, or fear any enemy. They carried their vows sometimes to the point of absurdity. One cause is mentioned of a band of twenty that were crossing the river on the ice; the leader incautiously came against a hole, which he would not pass around, but kept his course, going in and drowning; all but two of his followers went in and disappeared under the ice; and the two were saved only by their friends seizing them—such, at least, is the story,

but may have originated in a Frenchman's burlesque. However, a band of twenty-two were said to have died in a hopeless battle, except four who were carried off by their friends.

After the middle of October the rising winds and first snows of that stern climate warned the Americans that the river would soon fill with ice, and that they must provide for winter. Reaching the villages of the Mandans on the 20th, where the Aricara chief was well received, and every prospect of peace was indicated, the boats were hauled up, and a site selected.

The Mandans proved very friendly, supplying the travelers all the season with corn, and assisting in the buffalo hunting—as these animals still lingered to some extent in the bottoms to browse; as did also deer and elk. The winter proved cold, the thermometer dropping as low as thirty-eight below zero on a number of days. With excursions out upon the prairies, occasional gala days with the Indians, and observation of holidays like Christmas, when the men enjoyed a small allowance of grog, the time wore on. Acquaintance was made with the various tribes of Indians who were all enemies of the Sioux, and peace was formed between them. The boat had been sent back, and new ones were made for use the next season. The northwesterners of Canada learned of the expedition, and both McCracken and Mackenzie, of that Canadian company, visited them. It was stated also that the Sioux were furnished with arms by the northwesterners to carry on war against the Chippewas; and the Americans thought it advisable to promise the Mandans protection from their enemies.

At this winter fort was acquired the family that proved of so much service the next season. This was Chaboneau, who had been living with the Minaterres, above the Mandans, and his Shoshone wife, Sacajawea; and their child. Sacajawea had been captured as a child and made a slave, and was bought by the Frenchman; and although but young

when leaving the Rocky Mountains, still remembered much of the country.

April came in with fine weather, and by the seventh all was ready for a movement. The large boat was to return down the river, taking an Aricara chief and four men to visit the president, and various articles from the Indian country for Washington. The advance party, who were ready and shoved off in the stream at five o'clock, consisted of thirty-two, including Chaboneau and his wife and child, and a Mandan Indian, who wished to go to the country of the Shoshones and make an agreement of peace. The party with its baggage was accommodated in two large pirogues and six small canoes. The start was made in the face of a high northwest wind, which allowed but four miles progress before camping time; though otherwise the weather was fine. The barge, manned with seven soldiers and Mr. Gravelines as pilot, and bearing the presents and despatches, started down the river the same day.

The work of Lewis and Clark, and their company, for the second season was almost entirely exploring, intercourse with the Indians being on the western stretch chiefly for food and shelter; the negotiation of trade and arrangement of peace treaties between warring tribes being ended as they passed from the boundaries of the inhabited plains. Indeed, from the country of the Mandans to that of the Shoshones, west of the Rocky Mountains, no Indians were seen. Being thus unimpeded by long delays with Indian tribes, and speech-making, the progress of the party was much more rapid the second season. Points of particular interest passed were the mouth of the Yellowstone River, Marias River, the Gates of the Rocky Mountains, the Three Forks, and the summit of the Continental Divide.

Although April began with favorable days, and the ice disappeared from the Missouri, and the young grass quickly clothed the landscape with its delicate green, especially where the Indians had burned over the old growth—and

here the buffaloes flocked to browse,—May came in with a reverse current, and snow was seen covering the herbage, and ice gathered one-quarter an inch thick in their kettles. On the 26th of April the mouth of the stream, called by the French Roche Jaune, or as they translated it Yellowstone, was passed, and they learned that it rose near the sources of the Platte and Missouri, and might be navigated in canoes almost to its head. As the Indians told them “It runs through a mountainous country, but which in many parts is fertile and well timbered; it then waters a rich, delightful land, broken into valleys and meadows, and well supplied with wood and fresh water, till it reaches near the Missouri open meadows and low ground.” Indeed the ample bottoms, the recurving hills, or broken edges of the vast undulating plain, and the second bench, with abundance of timber and game, suggested here an ideal place for a trading post. The explorers were ever on the lookout for such locations, being impressed at Milk River, which they reached May 8, that here was a route to the northwest that might lead to control of the fur trade as far as “Athabasky.” Day after day was passed through “country beautiful in the extreme,” although as they proceeded the river narrowed, and presented a current often so strong as to require use of the towline along the shore; the hills “precipitated themselves into the river,” and rose ever higher and higher, and on their summits appeared tufts of pine. Evidences of a sharp climate were seen in that as late as May 23 there was severe frost, and water froze on the oars; and on the next morning ice an eighth of an inch thick formed in the kettles. May 26 was distinguished by the first sight of the Rocky Mountains; Captain Lewis made an ascent to the top of some hills on the north side of the river, and from these elevations commanded a clear prospect of its course for fifty miles, sunken between the now heavily rolling uplands, which were comparatively barren in appearance; and above these, still westward, an

irregular range of mountains spread itself from west to northwest. To the northward of these some still higher points appeared above the horizon, gleaming with snow, and were evidently of the great divide separating the waters of the Missouri and the Columbia. The change in climate and in the general appearance of the country is noticed, as the more broken lands are reached. The appeal to the imagination that the shapes of stone on the bluff sides were making is well shown in the following: "These hills and river cliffs exhibit a most extraordinary and romantic appearance. They rise in most places nearly perpendicularly from the river, to the height of between two and three hundred feet, and are formed of very white sandstone, so soft as to yield readily to the action of water, but in the upper part of which lie imbedded two or three thin horizontal strata of white freestone unaffected by the rain; and on the top is a dark rich loam, which forms a gradually ascending plain, from a mile to a mile and a half in extent, when the hills again rise abruptly to the height of about three hundred feet more. In trickling down the cliff the water has worn the soft sandstone into a thousand grotesque figures, among which, with a little fancy, may be discerned elegant ranges of freestone buildings, with columns variously sculptured, and supporting long and elegant galleries, while the parapets are adorned with statuary. On a nearer approach they represent every form of archaic ruins; columns, some with pedestals and capitals entire, others mutilated and prostrate, and some rising pyramidally over each other till they terminate in a sharp point. These are varied by niches, alcoves, and the customary appearances of desolated magnificence. The delusion is increased by the number of martens which have built their globular nests in the niches, and hover over these columns, as in our country they are accustomed to frequent large stone structures." Indeed the marvels of the mountains were just beginning to open here; with their architectural

contrivances, such as indeed in ancient lands taught man about all he has learned of structural art; and here impressed the explorers as if endeavoring to communicate some of their secret knowledge, so that they say, "As we advance there seems no end to the visionary enchantment that surrounds us," and then describe the dikes of trap, or of basalt, forming vast ranges of walls.

On June 2 in a violent storm of wind succeeded by rain they reached the mouth of the Maria's. It became here a nice point to decide which of the two rivers was the Missouri. Both the captains were fully aware of the trouble that would arise if they took the wrong course; remarking, "if after ascending to the Rocky Mountains, or beyond them, we should find that the river we were following did not come near the Columbia, and be obliged to return, we should not only lose the traveling season, but dishearten the men." A party was sent to explore each river, and while they were gone the two captains went together up onto the high grounds, overlooking the vast plain, spread here in every direction, over which the buffalo herds were roaming, attended by their enemies the wolves; they also saw again the Rocky Mountains, the nearer ranges being spotted with snow, while beyond rose much higher ridges, perfectly white. As the exploring parties returned without anything satisfactory, the two captains decided to make a reconnoissance in person. Lewis took the northern fork, and became convinced that its course led farther north than the route which he wished to follow. In this his judgment was good. On the return he narrowly escaped falling over a bluff ninety feet high into the river; and had just recovered himself when he heard his companion shout, and saw him in precisely the same predicament, but coolly told the man to cut footholes with his knife, and soon both were on safe ground. A pretty bit of sentiment in Lewis was naming the stream for a young lady, to whose gentleness and beauty, however, this turbid torrent from the

Rockies bore little resemblance. Hence the name, which was originally Maria's River.

An old boatman of the party, named Charatte, not being satisfied that the southern arm was the true Missouri, Lewis decided to explore this branch himself. On reaching the highland even grander views than before of the Rocky Mountains were presented, and in crossing the plain some of those singular flat-topped hills were seen that have impressed all travelers; and the question was at last decided by the roar of the Great Falls of the Missouri, seven miles distant. A picturesque description of this fall is given, which lack of space alone forbids quoting here. These falls are among the finest in the world, though not comparing in height with the Great Shoshone Falls. In this region were encountered some of the wonders of the mountains, one of which all but swept away Chaboneau and Sacajawea, and Clark himself. This was a cloudburst, which filled the gully in which these three—and the Chaboneau baby—had taken refuge, to a depth of fifteen feet with a raging torrent that bore down rocks and earth, and came with such suddenness that there was not a moment to be lost in escaping by clambering out up the canyon wall. Clark first saw the peril, and lifted the woman from below, while the Frenchman, too much excited to act coolly, dragged her as well as he could from above; she was encumbered with her child. Another of the wonders here noticed was the booming of the mountains, heard in the ranges to the northwest, and said by the watermen to be the explosion of veins of silver in the depths of the rock strata. These noises are described by the explorers: "Since our arrival at the falls we have repeatedly heard strange noises coming from the mountains a little to the north of west. It is heard at different times of the day or night (sometimes when the air is perfectly still and without a cloud), and consists of one stroke only, or of five or six discharges in quick succession. It is loud and resembles precisely the sound of a piece of

ordnance at the distance of three miles." It is said that these mysterious noises are still heard. Certainly the falls, aggregating a descent of four hundred feet, and which no white man had ever seen before; the violence of nature as now shown in the cloudbursts, and the winds rushing from the mountains to the plains; the unaccountable noises in the mountains far to the northwest; and the now constant sight of the mountains themselves, which to the north and northwest were still covered with snow, and glistened with great beauty "when the sun shone upon them, and from this glittering appearance most probably have derived the name of the Shining mountains,"—were calculated to weave those subtle emotions of awe and dread that drove savages and many of the earlier explorers back to scenes less strange. But here was a spirit that did not yield to impalpable influences, and although curiously noting all these facts, the explorers simply pressed westward.

On the 15th of July they reached what they very appropriately called The Gates of the Rocky Mountains; where "for five and three-quarter miles these rocks rise perpendicularly from the water's edge to the height of nearly twelve hundred feet. They are composed of black granite near their base, but from the lighter color above, and from the fragments, we suppose the upper part to be flint of a yellowish-brown and cream color. Nothing can be imagined more tremendous than the frowning darkness of these rocks, which project over the river and menace us with destruction. The river, one hundred and fifty yards in width, has forced its channel down this solid mass; but so reluctantly has it given way, that during the whole distance the water is very deep even at the edges, and for the first three miles there is not a spot, except for a few yards, in which a man could stand between the water and the towering perpendicular of the mountains."

Fortunately through this remarkable passageway the water was found not too swift for overcoming the current

with the oars; as neither pole nor towline, their resource in swift water, would have been any use here; and as it was, it was not until after dark—and a very great darkness in the narrow canyon—that a spot sufficient to allow camping grounds was found.

A milder and more beautiful scene was that at the Three Forks, which were reached on July 27, and all this was new to the sight of the white man. It is a region of surpassing loveliness, and from the hilltops inclosing the now broadened plan, more minute views were ever in sight of the mountains whose summits were Alpine in appearance. The little party of Americans, with representatives of several European nations, and of the red and black races also, were carrying here a greater fortitude, and a greater fate, indeed, than those of the ancient conqueror, who with a hundred thousand men behind him, must raise their drooping courage with the reflection "Their tops do not reach to heaven." Clark here went ahead, anxious to find traces of the Shoshones, and learn from them the best passes. With so many interesting objects to designate, these three almost equal branches were named respectively the Gallatin, Madison, and the Jefferson. It was determined to follow the later, or westernmost, as its sources could hardly fail to lead to the springs of the Columbia on the western side of the chain.

The toils up the Jefferson fork, with Lewis for the most part going ahead to look out a route, and leaving directions on poles at the forks of the streams, a green sapling in one case being cut down by a beaver, and pole and note thus carried off, can be only hinted at. But at last on August 12 the continental divide was reached by Lewis, still scouting ahead. He was following an Indian road, upon which tracks were seen, and he was anxious to overtake the party and assure them of friendship. As he pursued this track, the narrative says: "The road was still plain, and as it led directly toward the mountains, the stream gradually be-

came smaller, till after their advancing two miles further, it had so greatly diminished in width that one of the men in a fit of enthusiasm, with one foot on each side of the rivulet, thanked God that he had lived to bestride the Missouri. As they proceeded their hope of soon seeing the waters of the Columbia rose to almost painful anxiety; when at the distance of four miles from the last abrupt turn of the stream, they reached a small gap, formed by the high mountains which recede on either side, leaving room for the Indian road. From the foot of one of the lowest of these mountains, which rises with a gentle ascent of about half a mile, issues the remotest water of the Missouri. "They had now reached the hidden sources of that river which had never before been seen by civilized man; and as they quenched their thirst at the chaste and icy fountain—as they sat down by the brink of that little rivulet, which yielded its distant and modest tribute to the parent ocean, they felt themselves rewarded for all their labors and difficulties. They left reluctantly this interesting spot, and, pursuing the Indian road through the interval of the hills, arrived at the top of a ridge from which they saw high mountains, partially covered with snow, still to the west of them. The ridge on which they stood formed the dividing line between the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. They followed a descent much steeper than on the eastern side, and at the distance of three-quarters of a mile reached a handsome, bold creek of cold clear water, running to the westward. They stopped to taste for the first time the waters of the Columbia, and after a few minutes followed the road across steep hills and low hollows, when they came to a spring on the side of the mountain. Here they found a sufficient quantity of dry willow brush for fuel, and therefore halted for the night."

The main concern now with Captain Lewis and his little squad, as the main party under Clark was still behind, and toiling with the canoes up the dwindling waters of the

Jefferson, or Red Rock, was to come upon the Indians, whose tracks they still followed, in such a way as not to startle them, or be taken for enemies before their pacific disposition could be known. While still upon the Missouri side, Lewis had sighted one lone Indian who he saw at a distance through his glass was not of any tribe eastward, and whom he concluded must be a Shoshone. The Indian was mounted upon a fine horse, and observed the captain at almost the same instant. Lewis advanced alone, his two men being at some distance behind, until as near as he dared approach without startling the Shoshone; then unfolded a blanket, held it over his head, and laid it on the ground, which is the universal sign of peace. He also laid aside his gun, and was about to go nearer, when the two men, Drewyer and Shields, came in view; Lewis was fearful of startling the Indian by shouting to them to halt, but beckoned the sign of peace, and laid some trinkets on the blanket. The Indian, however, kept his eye on the two soldiers, whose stupidity was not a little annoying. Drewyer soon caught the idea and halted, but Shields came forward thoughtlessly, and the Indian wheeled and disappeared in the bushes.

Early the next morning, after crossing the divide, Lewis started in search of the Shoshones again, taking the Indian road which led westerly through an open broken country, being pleased with finding honeysuckles in bloom. "They proceeded along a waving plain parallel to the valley for some four miles," the journey continues, "when they discovered two women, a man, and some dogs on an eminence at the distance of a mile before them." Lewis was seen and watched with close attention, and went forward until within half a mile; then ordering his men to halt, and laying down his knapsack, unfurled a flag, also a sign of peace, and went forward alone. The women soon retreated; the man remained until Lewis was within a hundred yards, and then followed the women. The dogs alone were left.

Thinking still to make some use of the incident the captain went to the place, and tried to catch a dog and tie a trinket about its neck; but this the animal would not allow, and it too soon disappeared.

Calling his men the captain began again following the trail, which was now much worn and dusty as from recent travel. In about a mile they came suddenly upon three women, from whom they had been concealed by a deep ravine in which the road wound. One of the women, who was young, instantly took to flight; the others, an old woman and little girl, thinking escape impossible, crouched and held their heads down, as if reconciled to the speedy death that they supposed awaited them. "Captain Lewis instantly put down his rifle and advancing toward them took the woman by the hand, raised her up, and repeated the words *tabba bone*, the Shoshone for white man." He also rolled up his sleeve to show her his white skin, as his face and hands were now so much tanned as to differ little from the color of the Indian's. She was instantly relieved and her fears were changed to great confidence when given some beads and awls, and pewter mirrors, and paint—articles of great worth to the Indian. Lewis was afraid now that the young woman would reach the camp and give an alarm, and told the older one to call her; which was done, and the younger came back almost at once much out of breath, but dazzled by the presents, and wondering at the kindness of the strangers. She was given the same as the others, and then the faces of all three were painted vermilion by the captain, in sign of peace.

After the women had become sufficiently composed, and certainly they acted very intelligently, they were informed by signs that the white men wished to go to their camp; and they were willing at once to show the way. After going two miles along the road down the river they were met by a party of sixty Indians, in full war dress, well-armed, and mounted on fine horses, coming at full speed.

Lewis at once laid down his gun, halted his two men, and taking the flag advanced to meet them alone. To the chief, who with two companions was riding ahead, the women now began telling that the strangers were white men, and with great exultation showed their presents. This was understood immediately, and the three leaders dismounting embraced Lewis, laying their cheeks against his, and shouting "We are rejoiced, we are rejoiced." The spirit of their salutation was, however, more agreeable to the captain than the manner, as their war paint was well distributed over his face. However, he had every reason to be rejoiced also that his patience and address had at last won the hearty good will of a people upon whose friendship he must now rely implicitly in completing his passage of the mountains. The Indians also had great reason for thankfulness that the strangers, whose presence had been reported by the man seen on the headwaters of the Missouri, were whites, and not the dreaded Miniterres, or Pahkees, who had only the year before made an incursion and defeated them in a hard fight—being better armed.

The passage from the head of the Missouri to the navigable waters of the Columbia proved to be the critical period of the journey. This was due primarily to the difficult nature of the country, and the scarcity of food; and also, though not intentionally on their part, to the uncertain temper of the Indians. The details of this remarkable trip, which fascinates all who carefully examine the record, and can be appreciated only from a close reading of the complete journals, must be brushed over here and only the largest outlines noticed.

After reaching a friendly understanding with the chief of the Shoshones, whose name was Cameahwait, Lewis at length broached the subject of the larger party of white men approaching in canoes up the Missouri, and the reasons for their coming; which was that the Great Father at Washington wished to send his good-will to his brothers in

the west, and would trade with them for their furs the beads and blankets and cloths that the Indians all prized, and got now only occasionally from the white men at the great stinking lake—or ocean; and also would give them the guns and ammunition that would enable them to hunt the buffalo and be on an equality with the Sioux of the Plains, or the Blackfeet. He also thought it proper to tell him of the woman of their race who was returning with the boats to her people, and stimulated his curiosity by telling of the man they had with them, who was perfectly black, and not painted. He said that if the Shoshones would go to the forks of the Missouri with their horses and bring the whites with their goods into their country, they should then trade and buy horses for the trip to the westward.

To all this Cameahwait readily agreed, and assembled his band, but when time for starting came next morning, but half a dozen of his people were ready to follow; and these only by the appeal of the chief, who was himself forced to his promise by Lewis saying that he understood that he was a brave man, and did not fear to die. Their reluctance arose from the whisper that, after all, this white man, whom they had never known before, might be in league with the dreaded Pahkees, and was but enticing them out of their haunts, to be surrounded and killed. When the chief, therefore, with half a dozen of his men, adhered to his word and started away, the whole tribe began wailing and mourning as if the devoted band had already been led to hopeless sacrifice. But these had not gone far with Lewis before a number more began following, and in a short time the whole band came; and instead of wailing their spirits were suddenly changed, and they advanced shouting and singing without a sign of fear or a thought of danger. This tribe was bitterly poor, having been robbed the year before; and were now almost destitute of food. Half a day they attempted to catch antelope without success; and so great was their hunger that when at length Drewyer shot a deer the

entire band went on the run to the spot, tearing the animal, the most of which was given to them, in pieces, eating it raw, and consuming even the entrails.

Seeing their changeable temper Lewis, as the party neared the forks of the Missouri, stated more particularly to Cameahwait that it might be that Clark and the boats would not yet be there; he must not be disappointed, as the water was very bad. This threw the Shoshones into consternation. The doubtful ones, who had already thought their chief was reposing too much confidence in the word of a stranger, declared that all was now plain. They were but being enticed further and further into the enemy's country, and would soon be surprised and unable to defend themselves. In this strait Lewis showed great heroism, and cool judgment. He told Cameahwait that it was thought disgraceful in a white man to lie, even to an enemy; much more to a friend; Clark would surely be at the forks, or but a short distance below; the white men were anxious to bring good-will and open trade, and would not throw away all their hopes by deception. He then gave the chief his gun and ammunition, and told him he might kill him any time if it proved that he had spoken an untruth. By this the chief was reassured, and held his band together, who proceeded, and on the morning reached the forks. They found none of the boats there; but Lewis had retained the mastery of the Indians, and with no great show of fear they followed his lead further.

The meeting with the boats soon after was a great relief to Lewis; and was very dramatic to the Indians. Sacajawea was among the first at the boats to detect the Shoshones appearing over the brows of the mountains. She soon saw that they were her tribe, and danced with delight, sucking her fingers to show that they were her people, and when they came near ran among them, recognizing first a young woman about her own age, who had been taken cap-

tive at the same time, but had been returned. In the chief she soon knew her brother, whom she met with all the transports that any woman would feel under the same circumstances; and he was nearly as much affected. To her sorrow, however, she learned that all her family, except this and another member, were no longer living. It was only as interrupted by tears that she could interpret—this becoming now very necessary. The complete confirmation of all that Lewis had said, and especially the great praise that his sister bestowed upon the white men, the Americans, restored all the first confidence of Cameahwait, and in turn raised him greatly in the estimation of his tribe. Horses were easily obtained now to pack the goods from the canoes over the mountains to the navigable streams of the Columbia, and an old man was found who said that he could guide them.

Lewis thought it possible that a practicable route might be found on the Salmon River. The old Indian said that this was impassable; that after entering lofty mountains the rivers became so violent as to be white with foam for twenty miles, and then entered country so difficult that none of them had ever, in all man's remembrance, traversed it. After a thorough reconnoissance Clark found the old guide's story amply confirmed, following the mad stream until he saw it enter the mountain canyon, whiten with foam, and then disappear in a chain beyond which rose terrific mountains still white with snow. The advice to try a river much farther to the north was adopted, and that very wisely; and the party, with the Indians still accompanying, prepared to cross a high and difficult divide to reach the headwaters of Clark's Fork, or the Bitter Root. Here Sacajawea was again of great assistance. She revealed to the captains that her brother intended leaving them here, and assembling his tribe to hunt buffalo on the Missouri. This was a violation of his agreement, as he had promised to see them onto the Bitter Root. Lewis at once

charged him with this intent, before the two other chiefs; these declared they had no such thought, but the proposition to hunt buffalo now was Cameahwait's alone. After a short silence he admitted this; urging that the season was late and without buffalo meat his people must starve; and that the tribes of the Flatheads were already assembling, and his people must go now, or not at all. The captains suspected that there was an object in detaining them, so as to keep among them the whites for protection, and to consume their goods; and pressed the promise of the chief directly upon him. He renewed his agreement, and saw the party safely onto the Bitter Root, in the deep valley known as Ross's Hole later, and then with some of the Flatheads went for buffalo. This was the only real breach of his word—or contemplated breach, that this chief showed; and the honorableness of all his dealings, and of his whole tribe, impressed the Americans deeply. Only one article was lost, a hatchet, which was returned by the Indians. Indeed the Shoshones, in spite of their constant privations and miseries, and losses by war, impressed the Americans as peculiarly manly. Their only reason for not coping with the Blackfeet and Sioux was inferiority of numbers and arms. Among these Indians, as among the Aricaras, whipping of children was not practised, as it broke the spirit of the child.

Our natural curiosity to know how the Lewis and Clark party was regarded by the Indians themselves, when first seen, has fortunately been gratified to some extent by publication of two stories, or historical legends, still surviving among the Flatheads and the Nez Perces. In the beautiful valley of the Bitter Root, with the swiftly gliding stream that was named Clark's Fork, the tribe who made themselves known as Ootlashoots, but now called Flatheads, for no other reason apparently than that they do not flatten the head, was met, and proved entirely friendly. The meeting is somewhat briefly described by the explorers as follows:

"We pursued the course of the stream for three miles till it emptied itself into a river from the east. In the wide valley at their junction we discovered a large encampment of Indians, and on reaching them and alighting from our horses we were received with much cordiality. A council was immediately assembled, white robes were thrown over our shoulders, and the pipe of peace was introduced. After this ceremony, as it was too late to go any farther, we encamped, and continued smoking and conversing with the chiefs until a late hour."

In the Indian account many more details are noticed, showing with what importance much that goes with the whites as trifling is carefully observed by the native as giving a clue to character or purpose. Their story is as follows, as recounted to a priest by an old Indian woman of the tribe, named Agnes:

"The Flathead Indians were camping one day at Ross's Hole, or Ross's Fork, at the head of Bitter Root Valley, when one day the old chief Three Eagles, the father of chief Victor, and grandfather of Carlos, left the camp to go scouting the country, fearing that there might be some Indian enemy about to steal the horses, as was done very frequently. He saw at a distance Lewis and Clark's party, about twenty men, each man leading two pack horses, except two, who were riding ahead, who were Lewis and Clark. The old chief seeing that these men wore no blankets, did not know what to think of them. It was the first time he had seen men without blankets; what kind of beings could they be? The first thought was that they were a party who, traveling, had been robbed by some Indians. He went back to his people and reporting what he had seen, gave orders that the horses should be driven in and watched. He then went back toward the party of strange beings, and hiding in the timber, watched them. When they came to the open prairie he noticed that they traveled slowly and unconcerned, all together, the two leaders going ahead and looking around, as if surveying the country, and consulting with their men. He thought: These must be two chiefs; but what can they be after? To make things more complicated for the chief, there was a colored man in the party. What could this man be? When the Indians go to the buffalo country they have a custom, if any sign of an enemy appears, to have a war dance, to encourage one another to fight and be brave. For this dance the Indian warriors would paint themselves, some in red, some in yellow, some in black, etc., and from the color each had chosen to paint himself his name was called. This black face, thought the old chief, must surely be a man who painted his face black in sign of war. The party

must have had a fight with some hostile Indians and escaped from their enemies, losing only their blankets. Seeing that the strangers were traveling toward his camp, the old chief went back to his people and told them to keep quiet and wait for the party to come near. From the easy and unconcerned way the strange beings were traveling the Indians inferred that they had no intention of fighting or doing them injury. Hence when they saw the strangers advancing in the same manner, toward them, and were already near their camp, the Indians did not move, but kept watching.

"When the two leaders of the party, arriving at the Indian camp, showed friendship, there was a universal shaking of hands. The chief then gave orders to bring in the best buffalo hides, for each man to sit on, and the best buffalo robes also, for each man to use as a blanket. Then the two leaders, observing that the Indians were using for smoking the leaves of some plant, a plant very much alike to our tobacco plant, asked for some, and filled their pipes. But as soon as they tried to smoke they pronounced the Indian tobacco no good; and cutting some of their own kind of tobacco, gave it to the Indians, telling them to fill their pipes with it. But it was too much for them, who had never tried the American weed, and all began to cough, with great delight to the party. Then the two leaders asked for some Kinnekanick, mixed it with the tobacco, and gave again the prepared weed to smoke. This time the Indians found it excellent, and in their way thanked the men, whom they now believed a friendly party. On their side the whites, seeing the friendly dispositions of the Indians, decided to camp right there, and they began to unpack their horses, giving the Indians to understand that they also had blankets in their packs, but they used them only to sleep on, and gave them back the robes. The Indians were soon out of their wits when they saw some of the men packing on their shoulders some pretty good-sized logs for their camp fires, and conceived a great idea of the power of the white man. All went friendly, and after three days they started off, directed to Lolo Forks trail by the Indians, as the best way to go to the Nez Percés' country."

The above is as written for the *Western Wonderland*, for 1900, by Father Daste, of the Kalispel Mission. The extreme liberality of the Flatheads in giving each of the party of Americans two of their best buffalo robes, simply because they had been attacked and robbed; and that no thought seems to have occurred to the chief that he might attack and rob them of the rest of their belongings, including the horses, of which no Indians ever had enough, is good indication of the disposition even at the time of this brave and high-minded people.

The Old Shoshone and his son, and Sacajawea, still continued with Lewis and Clark, and after three days' rest and

recuperation on the banks of the Bitter Root, they were ready to turn westward. The old guide said that he did not know where the river they were now on might lead, and it was necessary to cross the main chain of the Bitter Root Mountains, which are in reality but the Western Cordillera of the Rockies themselves. They were high and stony, and for a time it seemed as if they would prove too much for the little party. The rocks were so jagged as to cut and cripple the horses' feet. The ascents were so steep in places as to baffle the animals, which if forced along, were in imminent peril of losing footing entirely and sliding off the perilous cliffs into the gorges below—as did actually happen in several cases. Packs were also turned, and horses fell with, or upon, their loads. Although but September, in that high altitude the air was like winter, the rocks being coated with ice every morning, and storms of snow and sleet one or two days so obscuring the path with the fresh fall as to give no sign of the trail except where the passing animals had left indications on the low boughs of the stunted timber. For a day or two the situation seemed critical in the extreme, progress seeming almost out of question, and to return and attempt to winter in the mountains seeming equally demoralizing. Food became low, the last slices of pork, which had been kept as the last resource, disappearing, and game ever since entering these high and barren mountains being scarce and shy.

After eating horse meat a number of days Captain Clark decided to go forward with six of the hunters and obtain game if possible, as the men were becoming weak from fasting, or sick with dysentery. The journal says:

"September 20. Captain Clark went on through a country as rugged as before, till on passing a low mountain, at the distance of four miles, he came to the forks of a large creek. Down this he proceeded south 60 degrees, west two miles, then turning to the right continued over a dividing ridge, where were the heads of several little streams, and at twelve miles' distance descended the last of the Rocky Mountains, and reached the level country. A beautiful open plain, partially supplied with pine, now presented itself. After

proceeding five miles he discovered three Indian boys, who observing the party ran off and hid themselves in the grass. Captain Clark immediately alighted, and giving his horse and gun to one of the men went after the boys. He soon relieved their apprehensions and sent them forward to the village, about a mile off, with presents of small pieces of riband. Soon after the boys reached home a man came out, but with great caution; he conducted them to a large tent in the village, and all the inhabitants gathered around to view with a mixture of fear and pleasure the wonderful strangers. The conductor now informed Captain Clark that the spacious tent he was in was the residence of the great chief, who had set out three days ago, with all the warriors, to attack some of their enemies toward the southwest; that he would not return before fifteen or eighteen days, and that in the meantime there were only a few men left to guard the women and children. The Indians now set before them (Captain Clark and his six men) a small piece of buffalo meat, some dried salmon, berries, and several kinds of roots. Among these last was one that was round, much like an onion in appearance, and sweet to the taste; its name is *quamash*, and it is eaten either in its natural state, boiled into a kind of a soup, or made into a cake, when it is called *pasheco*. After their long abstinence this was a sumptuous treat. They returned the kindness of the people by a few small presents, and then went on, in company with one of the chiefs, to a second village in the same plain, at a distance of two miles. Here they were treated with great kindness, and passed the night. The hunters were sent out, but though they saw some tracks of deer, were unable to procure anything."

The Indian story of this meeting with the first white men has been preserved, and was published in *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, as written by Miss Kate Macbeth, of Lapwai. There is not the slightest doubt of the accuracy of Miss Macbeth's rendition of the story, or that it is now current and fully believed by the Nez Percés, though there is a touch of romance about it that suggests to the skeptical reader or critical historian that it was of imaginative origin. Our judgment, however, is that it is substantially true. The devout Indians consider the appearance of the white men as providential, and it is certain that they became from that day the fast friends of the whites, and but for this friendship the occupation of Oregon by the Americans would have more than once been attended with difficulties that might have proved insuperable to any force that the Americans would have been able at the time to bring to bear. In the valuable account of the Lewis and Clark expedition in

Western Wonderland, before alluded to—though having some surprising inaccuracies—not full justice is done to the steadfast friendship of the Nez Perces; it is there said: "With, I think, but one exception, these royal representatives of the red race have always proved as friendly to the whites as Lewis and Clark found them. That exception was in 1877, when from the general region of Lewis and Clark's camp of the Chopunnish² of 1806, Chief Joseph began the Nez Perce war." As is well known, Chief Joseph's band was but a small part of the Nez Perce tribe, who as a people remained friendly and gave valuable assistance as scouts to the United States officers; and also Joseph was not from the region of the Chopunnish camp, but from Wallowa Valley in Oregon, though his first attacks were made in Idaho. The main Nez Perce nation whom Lewis and Clark describe, has without any exception remained faithful to the Americans; and the beginning of it, according to their own story, dated back even of Lewis and Clark, although they were profoundly affected by finding that these captains were as honorable and well disposed as reported by the woman who first brought them word of the whites. The story, as written by Miss Macbeth, is as follows:

"The Lolo trail is a very old one, and was used before there were any whites in the country to help make it. It was over this that Lewis and Clark came into the Weippe country. Later it was improved considerably by the whites, and for a time was better than another sometimes used, called the Elk City trail, which is also a very old one.

"In olden times the buffalo country in Montana was the camping ground of all the tribes far and near. There many battles were fought among themselves, and those taken captive were claimed as slaves by the victors. A Nez Perce woman, Watkuese [Wat-ku-ese] was taken captive by a tribe, who, on their return to their own land, fought with another tribe, and the Nez Perce woman was again captured, and carried further and further away; and it was while there (thus far removed from her own country) she, the first Nez Perce to do so, looked upon a white face. We are inclined to think she must have been taken near the Red River settlement, because she saw corn in the land to which she was carried. Sometime afterward, having upon

²The camp of the "Chopunnish" was made on the return journey, 1806.

her back a child which she had borne, she made her escape from her Indian masters, and along her roaming way from them met with much kindness from the whites, whom she called So-yah-po,³ or the Crowned Ones (because of the hat). Her child died, and she buried it beside the trail in the Flat-head country, which she had now reached on her journey homeward. There she was fortunate in finding some of the Nez Perces, who brought her home, a poor diseased woman. She had much to tell of the strange people with the white eyes, who had been so kind to her.

"Later this poor woman was with a great company of Nez Perces on their best camas ground, the Weippe, when Lewis and Clark with their company came in over the Lolo trail and surprised them there. Their first impulse was to kill them. Watkuese lay dying in her tent, but was told about the strange people who were now on the ground. She at once began to plead for them, saying, 'Do not harm them, for they are the crowned ones who were so kind to me; do not be afraid of them; go near to them.'

"Cautiously they approached, and the whites shook their hands; this they had never seen before, and in surprise they said to one another, 'They dandle us.' Watkuese died that same day, but had lived long enough to keep Lewis and Clark from being put to death by these naked savages, the Nez Perces. Their fear of the pale face soon vanished, and they became friends. Some of the Nez Perces guided them down into their beautiful Kamiah Valley, and on down the Clearwater River. At North Fork an Indian presented the white leaders with some very fine fish. Lewis, or Clark, carefully unrolled a package containing a piece of cloth, the first they had seen; they now think it was a flag; and tearing a red band from it wound it around the head of the man who had given the fish, and by this act the Nez Perce chief was made. They separated at Lewiston, Lewis and Clark intrusting many things of value with them, and found them safe when they returned the following year."

There is no essential disaccordance between this story and the account of the explorers themselves; although to the Indians all seemed remarkable and the most trifling incidents were observed with closest attention—as whites themselves would undoubtedly narrowly watch and note down the minutest acts or words of new beings come among them without announcement, and of a character bordering on the supernatural.

The Nez Perces were found, on the whole, the most superior of any tribe, unless possibly some on the plains; being very reliable, generally amiable, and ready to assist.

³Also spelled Snapias.

They were less mobile than the Shoshones, less ready to give without pay—although on a number of occasions showing remarkable liberality; and having a certain closeness in bargaining, and a surprising coolness of manner; characteristics still noticeable among them, although their sterling honesty was noted again and again. Indeed on their return one of the first of these Indians met was one bringing a canister of powder that had been cached, but scented and dug up by his dog.

The party now were readily guided down the river, shown a place where cedar for canoes might be found, and assisted in making the craft. Two chiefs consented to guide the party down the Clearwater; continuing, indeed, as far as the Cascades. The horses and saddles were intrusted to the care of the old chief, Twisted Hair, and were found in fairly good condition on the return. Indeed the next year considerable time was spent with the Nez Perces, waiting for the snow to melt on the Rockies, and with a few slight misunderstandings a very strong friendship was formed. Many acts of liberality are noticed, such as gifts of horses, though in general the bargaining character, and that closeness and imperturbability that is often seen in the Indian and nonplusses the white man, is spoken of as the prevailing sentiment.

Indications are seen in the journal, as the canoe voyage down the Clearwater to the Snake, and down the Snake to the Columbia, is recorded, of a satiety of grandeurs of scenery, and the weariness of body that leaves little strength for enjoyments of the mind. The mountains, or the broken edge of the great Palouse highland impending over the Clearwater and the Snake at Lewiston, which is ten times as high as the sandstone carved bluffs that were so admired on the Missouri, and more than twice the height of the walls of the Gates of the Rocky Mountains, are passed without notice. Even the dangers of the rivers, breaking often into rapids, are alluded to with nonchalance. At the union of

the Snake, which by triangulation was found to be five hundred and seventy yards wide, with the Columbia from the north, which was figured at nine hundred and sixty yards, spreading soon after their union to a width of two or three miles, the tone of the journal becomes more enthusiastic. The wonderful clearness of the Columbia, which was called Clark's Fork, in which salmon swimming to the depth of twenty feet could be plainly seen, made a striking contrast to the wonderfully tinted Snake, then of the peculiarly greenish-blue tint that has so excited the enthusiasm of artists.

These were now the October days, the weather was fair, and indeed the heat ever since passing the Rockies was oppressive much of the time. Clark spent a day ascending the Columbia above its junction with the Snake, and found many Indians all busy gathering and drying salmon, of which immense quantities were seen in the river and stranded on the shore, drifting down after spawning. Dog flesh, however, was generally preferred to the salmon, which was out of season and not appetizing; though the Indians of the Columbia, unlike the Sioux, refuse to eat dog meat, and the Nez Perces even ridiculed the whites as eaters of dogs and horses.

Good progress was made down the now shrunken but still great river of the west; many Indian tribes were passed, all busy taking salmon and drying them on scaffolds over the river, and all friendly. The "Wallah Wallahs" were distinguished from the others, and the next year rendered efficient service in guiding the travelers over the hills to the Nez Perces. Mt. Adams, mistaken for Mt. St. Helens, was sighted on October 19, correctly estimated at one hundred and fifty miles distant—St. Helens itself being over two hundred; on the 19th a conical mountain, covered with snow, was seen at the southwest, and as the Indian guides said this was near the falls which they called Tumtum, the name Timm Mountain was given to this snow peak; being,

of course, Mt. Hood. This name *tim* is a curious illustration, seen many times, of a misapprehension on the part of the whites or a mere careless slip. The word, of course, is Tum-Tum. The name given to the Clearwater, Cooscoosk, was a mere word indicating water in general, as Indians had no names for running streams. Early writers, who have been copied even by scientific students, have reversed the names of the Indian deities of the Clatsops. The list of such mistakes might be indefinitely extended. An amusing incident occurred the day that Mt. Adams was seen. After shooting a white crane, Lewis, who was walking on the shore, entered the huts of some Indians whom he found crouching in terror. They had heard the explosion of his gun, and seen something drop from the sky. Not until then had they seen him, who looked so strange, in white man's dress, with white skin and beard, that they at once concluded that it was he that had fallen from the sky; and it was some little time before they were recovered from their astonishment enough to be persuaded that he was a mortal.

On the 22d the mouth of the Deschutes River was passed, to which was given the rather formidable name of Towanihooks; and soon was heard the roar of the great falls at Celilo. Great numbers of perfectly peaceable natives were found here catching and drying fish, and stacks of pemmican were seen along the shore, awaiting final deposits in baskets. Among the multitude of Indians they found none unfriendly, and persuaded the Nez Perce guides to go to the village below, which these were at first very unwilling to do, as they were enemies. But a peace was arranged between the two, and no one was hurt, the chiefs returning to their own country on horseback. The Indians, as well as we who read of the exploit, were astonished to see the white men's canoes shoot through the rapids and over the black waters of the whirlpool, but reaching at length the calm water below in safety. They found here also an entirely

different language and people; the Chinook tribes, in fact, extending as far up as the Lower Dalles. This point became in later times a notoriously hard place, stealing being regularly practiced upon travelers. Though suffering some annoyances from this the explorers had little difficulty. Indeed they conducted the expedition here with the most consummate discretion, furnishing a model of what should have been the white man's course in every case. Always on guard and ready to repel any attack, they were equally careful not to provoke a quarrel, nor to offend the prejudices of the Indians; to consult first with the chiefs and place themselves confidently under their protection, and to scrupulously pay for all articles taken, and to religiously perform any agreement. The whole policy was to prevent trouble and to adapt their intercourse to meet the Indians' notions of honor. They did not have in all respects a moral class of men in their company, as a band of soldiers would hardly be expected to furnish an example of virtue, but even with such men the feelings of the Indians were not allowed to suffer outrage.

The course down from the Dalles to the Cascades was interrupted only by the high winds that rose in the afternoons, raising the now broad river to a sea white with waves; but on the second of November the Cascades were reached—called by the explorers not Cascades, but the Great Shoot,—and below this they observed the influence of the tides. This told them that the long conquest with broken water was now over, and that a route to the sea stretched unbroken before them. They had obtained now some canoes of Chinook construction, which struck them as models of beauty and withstood the most dangerous seas.

(To be continued.)

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

CONTENTS

Frontispiece: Cyrus W. Field.	
One Country or Forty-five? By James Q. Howard	367
The Origin of the Book of Mormon. By Theodore Schroeder	380
The Influence of the French in the Settlement of North America. By Mrs. C. F. McLean	397
New York in the Nineteenth Century. By John Austin Stevens. (<i>Fourth Paper</i>)	407
The Morris Family of Morrisania. By W. W. Spooner. (<i>Conclusion</i>)	427
The Lewis and Clark Expedition. By Horace S. Lyman. (<i>Conclusion</i>)	439

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE is issued on the fifteenth day each of January, March, May, July, September, and November, at Three Dollars per annum, Fifty Cents per single copy. Subscribers failing to receive their copies by the first day of the succeeding month should immediately notify the publishers; otherwise it may not be possible to supply the missing number.

The contents of each number are protected by copyright. Permission to reprint any article or illustration must be specially obtained from the publishers.


Advertising rates will be furnished on application; none but strictly high-class advertising matter will be admitted. Advertisements must be received by the fifteenth day of the month preceding the month of issue.

Application made at the New York Post Office for entry as second-class mail matter.

THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK,
Publishers,
41 Lafayette Place,
New York, U. S. A.

Copyright, 1906, by
THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK.

All rights reserved.



James W. Dille.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. I

SEPTEMBER, 1906.

NO. 5

ONE COUNTRY OR FORTY-FIVE?

BY JAMES Q. HOWARD.

WAS the slaying of nearly a half million men because Abraham Lincoln was constitutionally elected president of the United States over John C. Breckinridge a case of justifiable homicide? Should the crime of outvoting the minority at a general election be punished with such severity? Does one state, whose constitution and laws are supreme, exist, and has that state or nation a right to maintain its existence? If the wise fathers gave the republic they formed the right to exist, to live, they "delegated" to no state, to no domestic or foreign foe, the right to take its life, to destroy it. The power to destroy has been proven not to exist, and the right of destruction or disintegration would hardly be made an integral part of a union which was to be "a more perfect union" than a "perpetual union" that it superseded. Even our motto bears but one translation, *one* state from many. If it meant many states from many, the simple legend would be *E Pluribus Plures*.

In casting about for forty years for a justification for disunion by armed force, the latest apologists for secession have agreed with unanimity to rest their defense on state sovereignty. A final re-examination of the sufficiency of this last line of defense seems to be in order. Sovereignty means supremacy. A sovereign state is a supreme state, a state with no political superior. *If* a state is sovereign, that is, supreme, no power on earth can rightfully control it. It can do anything and everything. It can cede, or secede,

or proceed, or retrocede, or supersede, or go to seed. It can levy war on the United States, or on one of the states, or on all the states. It can make war on Europe, Asia, or Africa, or on itself. But assuming the exact thing to be proven—state supremacy—is an old way of getting over difficulties otherwise insurmountable.

Sovereignty, fortunately, is not a matter of theory but of fact. Cobweb spinning and logic chopping, special pleading and solemn theorizing, do not meet the requirements of the century-old contention. For, as a matter of incontestable historical fact, no state save Texas has been, since 1789, for one hour sovereign or for one hour independent. The thirteen original states were at first, of course, dependent colonies of Great Britain, with the sovereignty resting in the British crown. In 1774, 1775, 1776, and later, representatives were sent from all these colonies to the continental or central congress, which body exercised the principal powers and prerogatives of sovereignty. It appointed a commander-in-chief of its armies and issued to him almost daily orders; it commissioned and sent abroad envoys; it made treaties; it borrowed money and issued millions of continental paper bills; it also declared, on paper, independence. But that declaration was not made good until the surrender of Cornwallis in October, 1781. Not until the following year did England renounce her sovereignty over these colonies, through the preliminary treaty of peace of 1782, acknowledging them to be collectively free and collectively independent states. They had already been acting as such, the continental, and the congress of the confederation possessing the chief and distinctive powers and prerogatives of sovereignty.

As a matter of fact, the separate states under the confederation failed to comply with the pledges and conditions of their first written compact or articles of confederation, and taking advantage of their own wrong and the lack of central power to enforce conferred constitutional authority, they

gradually verged towards state isolation and virtual state independence. Hence from 1781 to 1789 we had the state sovereignty theory of government in full, practical operation. What came of this trial or experiment? The old government of the confederation was abandoned as a calamitous failure. It was universally called a rope of sand, a government by supplication. It perished through excess of state independence and lack of central power. The patriots of the convention of 1787, who, as Gladstone says, were probably the wisest body of men that ever assembled, refused to attempt to amend so worthless a fabric and literally wiped it out of existence. Yet there were men in 1861, whose sanity was not questioned, who wished to return to a device of government with as many heads as there were states, each claiming to be independent and each pretending to be supreme. Hamilton, Madison, Morris, Wilson, Washington, Franklin, and other framers, originally *cr de novo*, created a new organic law. As a means to the end of forming a "more perfect union," they provided "That this constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made under the authority of the United States, shall be the *supreme law of the land*; and the judges of every state shall be bound thereby, *anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding*." Now, if the men who made the constitution had studied ten years, they could not have found language to more plainly express their intention to establish a supreme central government, for they declare in express terms that it is supreme. They had voted down in the constitutional convention the New Jersey or Paterson plan, which was the state sovereignty scheme of a constitution. They had adopted substantially the Randolph or Virginia plan, which was as broadly national as Madison and Governor Randolph could make it. The plan meant national unity and affirmed nation supremacy. This supreme central power could alone safeguard the government arch-

ives and property, the blood-bought freedom, the common traditions and glory, the national good name, and the future fame and grandeur of the republic.

The completed work of the great convention having been submitted to "the people of the United States," acting for convenience through conventions called by these same people residing in the several states, in whose name the constitution was made, the unconditional ratifications of the people followed in due time. As both Madison and Hamilton declared, there could be no conditional ratifications or rejections. Recommendations of amendments were not antecedent terms or conditions. They were only proposals or suggested changes.

Now came the second square issue between national unity and national distintegration. George Clinton, Patrick Henry, James Monroe and other enemies of the new constitution, opposed it because it destroyed the sovereignty of the states, as they said, and *did* establish a supreme central government. This was what they did not want. But this was precisely what the people of the United States did want, for the requisite number of states ratified the constitution as it was, within nine months, and the great charter was in salutary operation in nineteen months.

The third triumph of nation sovereignty came in 1794 under the first and greatest of the presidents, Washington. The occasion was the armed suppression of the Whiskey Insurrection in Pennsylvania. The same issue discussed by Meade and Lee at Gettysburg was discussed in Washington's cabinet. Jefferson, the great apostle of disintegration, took the ground in his unofficial correspondence that the laws imposing a small internal revenue tax on distilled whiskey were "infamous," although three pence per gallon less than before imposed; that if citizens so oppressed were doing anything improper, the governor of Pennsylvania would kindly lead them back to the deserted path of duty. But Hamilton pointed out that the laws that were

being trampled upon were United States laws, that the president was sworn to execute these laws, that tarring and feathering revenue officers, driving them from their homes, and waylaying them on the public highways were acts of lawlessness which the national government was required to suppress. It is perhaps needless to repeat, what is well known history, that President Washington marched at the head of an army of fifteen thousand men to suppress by force this first rebellion; that from Carlisle, Pa., he sent forward Governor Henry Lee—the patriotic father of R. E. Lee—to the scene of the disturbance, but before that scene was reached the rebellion for free whiskey had melted or wilted away.

The next distinct issue between state and nation sovereignty was presented by Jefferson in his dismembering Kentucky Resolutions of 1798. The first of these resolutions ends: "that as in all other cases of compact among parties having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress." This resolution as it stands not only justifies nullification and secession, as President Roosevelt affirms in his "Life of Benton," but would in words warrant the blowing up of the public buildings at the capital with dynamite, should Delaware or Rhode Island "judge" that to be the best "mode" of redress for any real or imaginary grievance. Fortunately the constitution *does* provide a common judge or arbiter when it declares that "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made," and so forth.

What followed the passage of the Kentucky Resolutions is the more material point in our present contention. They were formally sent to the legislatures of the several states—then sixteen in number,—when Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, after beating up and down the whole land for one year and a half, succeeded in getting only two states out of

sixteen to endorse the disintegrating, state supremacy resolutions. An issue more distinctly drawn and a defeat more overwhelming cannot be found in American history.

A fifth authoritative recognition of the supremacy of the constitution and laws of the United States occurred in 1832, when President Andrew Jackson put down nullification in South Carolina. A denial of the sovereignty of the nation and a defiance of the supreme law was shown in a refusal to allow duties on imports to be collected at the port of Charleston, and in a passage by a state convention of a paper resolution of nullification. To impose on the feeble-minded, this resolve on paper was designated by the large-sounding word, "Ordinance." General Jackson's action was prompt and summary. He placed federal troops within easy striking distance of Charleston. The old hero had warrants prepared in the office of the attorney-general for the arrest for treason of John C. Calhoun and every member of congress from South Carolina in case these political agents did not by their influence prevent an open outbreak against the national government. He annihilated the heresy of nullification in a single sentence: "I consider, then, the power to annul a law of the United States, assumed by one state, incompatible with the existence of the union, contradicted expressly by the letter of the constitution, unauthorized by its spirit, inconsistent with every principle on which it was founded, and destructive of the great object for which it was formed." In six words Jackson expresses the essence of his creed, which is also the creed of the constitution: "Disunion by armed force is *treason*." The italics are his own.

In justice to a great statesman we should not omit to say that, two years prior, the pernicious pretension of state supremacy, then called peaceable secession, was put down so far as argument can put down anything, by Daniel Webster in his famous reply to Senator Hayne of South Carolina. The doctrine of national supremacy or the sovereignty of the republic was as forcibly and as unequivocally

affirmed by Webster, the pre-eminent expounder of the constitution, in January, 1830, as it ever had been by Alexander Hamilton or Chief-Justice Marshall.

The doctrine of unlimited disunion or disintegration was not revived, except as a threat or a suggested means of perpetuating slavery, until 1860-1, when the inexorable logic of Abraham Lincoln in his inaugural cast it for the seventh time out of the court or forum of reason, before the appeal had been taken from arguments to arms. The appeal from ballots to bullets, if right in 1861, would clearly justify such an appeal at every general election from that year to this, and would, of course, put an end to all government and hasten anarchy in its bloodiest forms. This would be worse than what Washington called "reducing the nation to a cipher."

Happily, southern patriots and statesmen have settled the sovereignty and allegiance questions for us. "I owe a paramount allegiance to the nation, a subordinate allegiance to my state," said Henry Clay. The judicial aim and life-lasting aspiration of the great chief-justice, John Marshall, was to make this union a more perfect union and the salutary supremacy of the constitution still more beneficent. That brave soldier and honest southern patriot, President Zachary Taylor, when disunion was threatened by unscrupulous men, with vehemence declared: "Disunion is treason!" Thomas H. Benton declared that "if he had been president in 1828, instead of threatening to hang Calhoun he would have hanged him on the eastern exposure of the capitol and appealed to the people of the United States to vindicate his action." The incomparable Father of his Country never admitted that he was the citizen of a state, but "I, George Washington, a citizen of the United States," is the language of his last will and testament, no less than of his whole life. Our highest allegiance then is due to the supreme authority of our country, the sovereign republic. Its decrees are final, its highest court the court of last

resort, its national legislature the supreme legislature, its chief of state the chief of all the states, the chief magistrate of all the people.

The conclusion is then that Washington had one country, not thirteen; that R. E. Lee had one country, not thirty-three; that we have one country, not forty-five. We may be certain that country is not synonymous with county, state, locality, town, or township. Lifting neighborhood above nation is not patriotism, but the reverse. Patriotism is not confined to slopes or valleys, ridges or basins. It is not a matter of sections, half-sections, or quarter-sections. It embraces not a political division or geographical portion of the republic, but the whole. Nowhere in the universe is a part greater than the whole, or equal to the whole. A state was never more than a thirteenth part of the nation; now it is a forty-fifth. States, or rather counties, have jurisdiction over the punishment of certain classes of crimes, counties control the building of bridges, school districts have exclusive charge of the management of schools, and although practically supreme in these directions, we hear nothing about sovereign counties or sovereign school districts. Armed resistance by a school district or county to the authority of a state or the nation would not be called patriotism but insurrection. Yet why should the citizens of a county suffer wrongs, real or imaginary, any more than the citizens of a state? If a paper resolution can take a state out of the union, a resolution on paper ought to take a county out of a state. It is conceded by every one that a state cannot withdraw itself from the union by means of a state law or state constitution, however formal or however solemn. How then can a hastily and loosely written "ordinance" or statement, rushed through a convention wild with excitement, do what the supreme law of a state cannot do?

Having settled the question, as we trust, that we have a country, and determined what that country is, and that the

more perfect union which our Fathers formed cannot be broken up like a game of whist or destroyed by force, which latter act the patriot Jackson officially declared to be "treason," it would seem to follow that a country which is sovereign and indestructible and whose purpose is to "establish justice" and "secure the blessings of liberty," is clearly entitled to our allegiance, fidelity, our loyalty and love.

How can this devotion to country be best exhibited? The world's history is full of examples of love of country, and our own land abounds in personifications of ideal patriotism and in individual instances of patriotic heroism. The first duty of a citizen is respect for an obedience to his country's laws. He should exhibit perfect freedom from every form of lawlessness, every species and description of disorder, and every kind and class of riot and outlawry. In the highest civilization, Order, which is Heaven's first law, will have a universal and an unending reign. The duty of obedience to law is not only a patriotic but a sacred duty. The uplifting expression, the majesty of the law, is a meaningless phrase with the rictous or seditious. Without law there is no peace, no progress, no tranquility, no safety, no civilization. The absence of law is anarchy, the goal of every murderous enemy of the human race. We hear men say that an amendment to the supreme law is distasteful, or that a provision of a national statute, also supreme, is unconstitutional, and from this they argue that both are invalid. However high or however low the citizen, the utterances or opinions of such critics have no more to do with making laws void or with relieving them or others from the obligations of obedience to all the laws of the land, than the use of the word "unconstitutional" by a parrot. Every article and every amendment to the constitution is valid, and every provision of statute law is binding, until declared otherwise by the highest judicial authority. Every man is not his own supreme court. All laws bind all until it is judicially declared that they bind

none. Whether we think a law expedient or not, wise or not, salutary or not, necessary or not, the obligation of obedience is just the same as if we thought it the wisest, the most salutary, and most necessary law enacted since the world was created.

That governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, means of course from the consent of the majority of the governed. That authentic and deliberate consent is made known in written constitutions and laws. If this misused phrase meant what some imagine, the consent of all the governed, then a statute inflicting penalties for burglary should contain a clause, "provided the burglar consents thereto." And the judge sentencing a murderer to be hung should add, "provided that the culprit approves of the execution." The will of the majority is the law of all. There is no higher law and can be no higher law than the constitution of our country, for that is the supreme will or law.

If a man's conscience, or alleged conscience, does not permit him to obey the supreme mandates of the country, the remedy is simple. He is at liberty to pass beyond the jurisdiction of his country's laws. Canada will afford him a safe and secure retreat. And Mexico, now governed by an able and a progressive dictator, Porfirio Diaz, will grant him an asylum, provided he obeys the laws of Mexico and all the decrees of the chief of state, a failure to do which is often followed by strangulation. Moreover, if a citizen finds that a frame-work of government sanctioned by Washington, Hamilton, Franklin, Marshall, Madison, and Jay, does not meet his august approval, he has only to proceed to Central and South America, where, among the endless variety of revolutionary governments, he can surely find one to his liking. But he should ever bear in mind this pregnant historical fact, that this is the only country since the broad, mild empire of Julius Cæsar, in which any high degree of

longevity has been reached by open enemies of the supreme government under which these enemies lived.

We need hardly affirm that no sane citizen who has mastered the alphabet of good citizenship will ever join fifty or a hundred or five hundred bad citizens in the commission of the crime of murder on pretence of reforming the morals of a community. You cannot punish alleged crime by committing actual crime. Removing one and adding a thousand criminals to the criminal classes is not progress except toward moral infamy. The good citizen is not the one who gives way to the passion of revenge and other passions, but the one who controls them. Let us not try to amend the command of God, *Thou shalt not kill!*

When President Cleveland, led by his able secretary of state, Mr. Olney, put an end to riot and the wanton destruction of life and property in Chicago, he deserved and received the nearly unanimous commendation of the American senate and people. Whether lawlessness is confined to a city, to a mining region, to a state, or to a number of states, the unlawful acts and their consequences are essentially the same. In each case there is a breach of the peace of the land. In each instance the laws, the supreme laws, are repudiated, defied, their binding force denied, whether this defiance is called nullification, insurrection, riot, conspiracy, or secession. If the constitution and general laws are trampled upon in Charleston, in Montgomery, or in Chicago, it matters not by what name the unlawful proceedings are called or under what pretexts they are excused. Pushed to its logical end the result is in each case the same—mob rule, disintegration, disunion, revolution, anarchy. Forty-five warring states, each supreme, each independent, each defiant, would be equivalent to this.

The lame excuse set forth by the seceders of 1860-1, is that the people of the eleven insurgent states were united and conscientious in their crusade of disintegration. United they were not; conscientious they may have been. But for

a fallible being to think himself right does not make himself right. To be willing to die in the last ditch, or in any ditch, or in any way, proves nothing. More men have met death in violent forms, through a mistaken conception of facts and duty, than have fallen in defense of the right. Ever since the world was peopled, men have cheerfully given up their lives for the propagation of the falsest of religions, the most detestable of causes, and in the most infamous of wars. The worst tortures of the Spanish Inquisition were deemed deeds of religious duty by the chief inquisitors. Booth and Guiteau were probably conscientious, but that did not make their beastly crimes meritorious. Ignorance of the law does not excuse the ordinary offender, hence we fail to see how ignorance of Article VI. of the constitution of the United States can excuse those who violate the expressly declared supreme law and insist that state constitutions, that is, states, are supreme. How can a state be supreme when its organic law, its constitution, is not? Sixteen of the chief and essential powers and prerogatives of sovereignty, we find, are conferred by the national constitution upon the nation. One prerogative of sovereignty, the enforcing of the major part of the property and criminal laws, has been left to the states, or rather, to the counties. This is a new sixteen to one that the riotous and seditious strikers of today should become enamored of. It is not so much the last rebellion, but the next, that is giving patriots concern. When workingmen will not work—misled by their worst enemies, the demagogues—the idle classes may soon pass over to the criminal classes, and then love of home and family and of country will cease to exist. Without fidelity to employer or to duty there is no fidelity.

Nation unity has been the dream and the realization of the first statesmen of all ages. These foremost patriots have wrought ever and always in the direction of the territorial integrity and the central union of enduring states and peoples. Passing by the great Alfred, Lord Chatham added

Canada to England and brought about the larger unity of the British empire. Count Cavour, Italy's greatest statesman, brought about Italian unity. Prince Bismarck, Germany's first historic man, battling against odds, brought about the unity of Germany. Of our own statesmen and benefactors who have toiled most for nation unity and nation supremacy, these noblest workers must always be named: Washington, Hamilton, Franklin, Marshall, Story, Jackson, Webster, Clay, Benton, Houston, Lincoln, Grant, Stanton and the Shermans. These men were not simply nationalists, they were nationalists, nation builders and preservers.

To give the names on the opposite side is to more distinctly mark the broadest line of cleavage in our political history, the disregard of which dividing line has confused and misled many of the writers of history. Of course the great leader in the school of national disintegration or state supremacy was Jefferson. Not only his accepted revolutionary Resolutions of '98, but his writings as a whole, tend to weaken and belittle the supreme central government. The wildest vagaries of the populists, including repudiation, can all be traced to the theories of this French socialist and agrarian philosopher. Calhoun and Jefferson Davis were his truest, most faithful, and sincerest followers. Nathaniel Macon, who rejoiced over the death of Washington, was an able disintegrationist, as were George Clinton of New York and Hayne of South Carolina. Stephens, Breckinridge, Toombs, Mason, Benjamin, Cobb, Yancey, R. E. Lee, and the Johnsons did much to discredit the glorious belief that we have one country and one flag. "I can foresee no evil greater than disunion," said Washington.

THE ORIGIN OF THE BOOK OF MORMON.

BY THEODORE SCHROEDER.

EVERY complete, critical discussion of the divine origin of the Book of Mormon naturally divides itself into three parts:—first, an examination as to the sufficiency of the evidence adduced in support of its miraculous and divine origin; second, an examination of the internal evidences of its origin,¹ such as its verbiage, its alleged history, chronology, archæology, etc.; third, an accounting for its existence by purely human agency and upon a rational basis, remembering that Joseph Smith, the nominal founder and first prophet of Mormonism, was probably too ignorant to have produced the volume unaided. Under the last head, two theories have been advocated by non-Mormons. By one of these, conscious fraud has been imputed to Smith, and by the other, psychic mysteries have been explored² in an effort to supplant the conscious fraud by an unconscious self-deception.

In 1834, four years after its first appearance, an effort was made to show that the Book of Mormon was a plagiarism from an unpublished novel of Solomon Spaulding. For a long time this seemed the accepted theory of all non-Mormons. In the past fifteen years, apparently following in the lead of President Fairchild of Oberlin College,³ all but two of the numerous writers upon the subject have asserted that the theory of the Spaulding manuscript origin of the Book of Mormon must be abandoned, and Mormons assert that only fools and knaves still profess belief in it.⁴ With these last conclusions I am compelled to disagree. In setting forth my convictions and the reasons for them,

I have undertaken nothing entirely new, but have only assigned myself the task of establishing as an historical fact what is now an abandoned and almost forgotten theory. This will be done by marshalling in its support a more complete array of the old evidences than has been heretofore made and the addition of new circumstantial evidence not heretofore used in this connection.

It will be shown that Solomon Spaulding was much interested in American antiquities; that he wrote a novel entitled the "Manuscript Found," in which he attempted to account for the existence of the American Indian by giving him an Israelitish origin; that the first incomplete outline of this story, with many features peculiar to itself and the Book of Mormon, is now in the library of Oberlin College, and that while the story as rewritten was in the hands of a prospective publisher, it was stolen from the office under circumstances which caused Sidney Rigdon, of early Mormon fame, to be suspected as the thief; that later Rigdon, on two occasions, exhibited a similar manuscript which in one instance he declared had been written by Spaulding and left with a printer for publication. It will be shown further that Rigdon had opportunity to steal the manuscript and that he foreknew the forthcoming and the contents of the Book of Mormon; that through Parley P. Pratt, later one of the first Mormon apostles, a plain and certain connection is traced between Sidney Rigdon and Joseph Smith, and that they were friends between 1827 and 1830. To all this will be added very conclusive evidence of the identity of the distinguished features of Spaulding's "Manuscript Found" and the Book of Mormon. These facts, coupled with Smith's admitted intellectual incapacity for producing the book unaided, will close the argument upon this branch of the question, and it is hoped will convince all not in the meshes of Mormonism that the Book of Mormon is a plagiarism. To those Mormons whose minds are untainted by mysticism, who have the intelligence

to weigh evidence and the courage to proclaim convictions opposed to accepted church theories—to such Mormons, though not convinced that the evidence here reviewed amounts to a demonstration, it must be that this essay will yet furnish even to them a more believable and more probable theory of the origin of the Book of Mormon than the one which involves a belief in undemonstrable miracles as well as matters entirely outside of all other experience of sane humans. Certainly the theory here advanced requires for its belief the acceptance of less of improbable assumption than does any other explanation offered. With this statement of what it is expected to accomplish we may proceed to review the evidence in detail.

Solomon Spaulding and his First Manuscript

Solomon Spaulding was born in 1761 at Ashford, Conn., graduated from Dartmouth in 1785, graduated in theology in 1787, and became an obscure preacher. The fact that Spaulding had become an infidel,⁵ that in rewriting the first outline of his story he adopted, as he said, "the old Scripture style" to make it seem more ancient,⁶ and the further fact that he told at least four persons at different times that his story would some day be accepted as veritable history⁷—all of these, combined with the peculiar product, tend to show that one motive for the writing of this supposed novel may have been the author's desire to burlesque the Bible and furnish a practical demonstration of the gullibility of the masses.

While at Dartmouth College, Spaulding had as a classmate the subsequently famous imposter and criminal, Stephen Burroughs,⁸ which fact furnishes interesting material for reflection as to how far the subsequent ill fame of Burroughs, coupled with personal acquaintance, may have operated in Spaulding as a fruitful suggestion inducing this labor as a means of securing fortune through fraud. If

Spaulding did not see the possibility of a new and profitable religion in his "Manuscript Found," then he was more short-sighted than was a nephew of his named King. This nephew told one Hale, a school-teacher, of his belief that he could start a new religion out of this novel and make money thereby, at the same time briefly outlining a plan very similar to the one long afterward adopted by Smith, Rigdon and Company.⁹ If we can place any confidence in the report of an interview between a Mormon "elder" and a nephew of Solomon Spaulding, then it would appear that in the opinion of the latter's brother Solomon Spaulding was not a man who would be, by conscientious scruples, deterred from practicing such a fraud, if believed profitable.¹⁰ Be that as it may, Spaulding did hope by the sale of his literary production to make sufficient money to enable him to pay his debts.¹¹

In 1809 Solomon Spaulding and Henry Lake built and conducted a forge at Salem (now Conneaut), O., where, in 1812, the former made his second business failure.¹²

Spaulding, being an invalid, possessed of a good education and habits of study, naturally took to literary work, which he probably commenced soon after 1809,¹³ and continued until his death in October, 1816. During this seven years he seems to have written several other manuscripts¹⁴ besides the two with which we are directly concerned.

Necessarily Spaulding's surroundings gave some direction to the course of his literary efforts. Environed as he was in a country where once dwelt the mound-builders, and having himself caused one of the mounds to be opened, with the resulting discovery of bones and relics of a supposedly prehistoric civilization,¹⁵ like thousands before him, he was led to speculate upon the character of that civilization and the origin of those ancient peoples. Josiah Priest, in his "Wonders of Nature and Providence" (1824), quotes over forty authors, half of whom are Americans, and all of whom, prior to 1824, advocated an Israelitish origin of the

American Indian. Some of these dated as far back as Clavigaro, a Catholic priest in the seventeenth century.

In Spaulding's first writing of his manuscript story, he pretended to find a roll of parchment in a stone box within a cave. In the Latin language, this contained an account of a party of Roman sea voyagers, who, in the time of Constantine, were, by storms, drifted ashore on the American continent. One of their number left this record of their travels, of Indian wars and customs, which record Spaulding pretends to have found and to translate.¹⁶ How that resembles a synopsis of the Book of Mormon!

In 1834, when E. D. Howe had in preparation his book, "Mormonism Unveiled," wherein the Spaulding story was first exploited, this first manuscript was given by Spaulding's family to D. P. Hurlburt, the agent of Howe. The Spaulding family, without having made any examination whatever of the papers delivered to Hurlburt, seem always to have believed,¹⁷ though without any evidence, that he received and sold to the Mormons the rewritten story entitled "Manuscript Found," which will be more fully discussed hereafter. From Howe this first manuscript story went into the possession of one L. L. Rice, who bought out Howe's business, and later, with other effects of Rice's, it was shipped to Honolulu, and there, in 1884, accidentally discovered by President James H. Fairchild of Oberlin College.¹⁸ This manuscript is now in the Oberlin library, and has been published by two of the Mormon sects as being a refutation of the Spaulding origin of the Book of Mormon. It can be such refutation only to those who mistake it for another story. Howe, in 1834, published a fair synopsis of the manuscript now at Oberlin¹⁹ and submitted the original to the witnesses who testified to the many points of identity between Spaulding's "Manuscript Found" and the Book of Mormon. These witnesses then (in 1834) recognized the manuscript, secured by Hurlburt and now at Oberlin, as being one of Spaulding's, but not the one which

they asserted was similar to the Book of Mormon. They further said that Spaulding had told them that he had altered his original plan of writing by going farther back with his dates and writing in the old Scripture style, in order that his story might appear more ancient.²⁰

According to many witnesses, the re-written "Manuscript Found" (like the Book of Mormon) was an attempt at imitating the literary style of the Bible. So was the manuscript submitted to Patterson, according to his own statement.²¹ No such indications are found in the Oberlin manuscript, which further evidences that it is not the manuscript of which the witnesses testified, and which Patterson says was submitted to him. The Oberlin manuscript also furnishes internal evidences of an improbability that it was ever submitted to a publisher by any man as sane and well educated as was Spaulding. The plot of the story is incomplete, and the manuscript is full of interlineations, alterations, careless or phonetic spelling, and misused capital letters. These are all easily explainable consistently with Spaulding's erudition, if we view the manuscript as a hasty and careless blocking out of his literary work, but it is not in such a condition as would make him willing to submit it to a publisher.

If we bear in mind that from the beginning it was asserted that this manuscript now at Oberlin was not the one from which the Book of Mormon was alleged to have been plagiarized, then President Fairchild's conclusion that it disproves such plagiarism of course becomes absurd and only demonstrates his ignorance of the early testimony upon which was asserted the connection of the Book of Mormon and another manuscript. This also disposes of the Mormon argument most frequently urged against the theory here advocated.

Either through like ignorance of the evidence of 1834 that this was not the manuscript then being testified about, or through a willingness to play upon the ignorance

of others, the two leading sects of Mormons have published this first manuscript as a refutation of a theory which no one ever advocated, viz.: That the manuscript now at Oberlin was the thing from which Smith *et al.* plagiarized the Book of Mormon. In my judgment, the publication of this first incomplete manuscript story furnishes additional evidence that the rewritten story did constitute the foundation of the Book of Mormon. When we remember what was said in 1834 as to the character of changes made in rewriting, and that the rewritten story was revamped by Smith, Rigdon, and Company, we are astonished at the number of similarities retained; as, for instance, the finding of the story in a stone box, its translation into English, the attempt to account for a portion of the population of this continent, the wars of extermination of two factions, the impossible slaughters of primitive warfare, and the physically impossible armies which were gathered without modern facilities of either transportation or the furnishing of supplies—the fact that after two rewritings, the second being by new authors, there should remain these very unusual features, makes the discovery and publication of this first manuscript only an additional evidence that the second one did furnish the basis of the Book of Mormon.

By always remembering these separate manuscripts and their different histories, much seeming conflict of evidence can be explained, mistaken conclusions accounted for, and confusion avoided. The Mormons, in their publication of this first manuscript story, have labelled it "The Manuscript Found," though no such title is discoverable anywhere upon or in the body of the manuscript in the Oberlin library.²² The evident purpose of this is to further confound that first story with the second or rewritten manuscript which it will be demonstrated really was used in constructing the Book of Mormon, and which manuscript the witnesses to be hereafter introduced described by that title. Having traced to its final resting-place at Oberlin

College the first manuscript story, which had no direct connection with the Book of Mormon and never was claimed to have such, let us now, if we can, trace into the Book of Mormon Spaulding's rewritten story, entitled "The Manuscript Found."

Spaulding's Rewritten Manuscript

Spaulding commenced his writing about 1809, changing his plans while still at Conneaut, that is, prior to 1812,²³ at which later date the rewritten story of "The Manuscript Found" was still incomplete.²⁴ In 1812 Spaulding borrowed some money with which to go to Pittsburg, hoping there to get his novel published and thus make it possible for him to pay his debts.²⁵ In Pittsburg Spaulding submitted his manuscript to one Robert Patterson, then engaged in the publishing business.²⁶ The exact date is not known, but it is probable almost to certainty that Spaulding would do this immediately upon his arrival in Pittsburg in 1812, since that was one of his definite purposes in going there. Spaulding's widow is reported as saying: "At length the manuscript was returned to the author, and soon after we removed to Amity, Washington County, Pa."²⁷ The return of the manuscript before 1814, the date of the removal to Amity, is made additionally certain by the testimony of Redick McKee²⁸ and Joseph Miller.²⁹ This additional evidence, especially that of the latter, makes it plain that Spaulding had his rewritten manuscript at Amity, thus demonstrating its return to Spaulding before the latter's removal from Pittsburg. The evidences of identity between the manuscript testified about as being at Amity, and Spaulding's rewritten story, leave no doubt. The review of this evidence of identity will be postponed until we come to review the other evidences of identity between "The Manuscript Found" and the Book of Mormon.

It is said that Patterson returned the manuscript to Spaulding with the advice to "polish it up, finish it, and

you will make money out of it."³⁰ On behalf of Patterson it has been said that he directed its return unless the author would furnish ample security to guarantee the expense of publishing, which we can readily believe to have been impossible to the impecunious Spaulding.³¹

After residing in Pittsburg two years,³² the Spauldings moved to Amity in Washington County, Pa., where Solomon Spaulding and his returned "Manuscript Found" again became the center of attraction among the commonplace neighborhood listeners, who did their loafing about the Spaulding tavern.³³ Here the story was polished and finished,³⁴ and from Amity Spaulding again journeyed to Pittsburg, in the hope in the second attempt of securing the publication of his story, "The Manuscript Found."³⁵ Spaulding's widow and daughter assert that at one time Patterson advised Spaulding "to make out a title-page and preface."³⁶ That remark would seem most likely to have been made after the finishing of the story, and I therefore feel justified in believing it to have been made after the second submission of the manuscript. Mrs. Spaulding-Davidson says this request was never complied with, but for reasons which are unknown to her. In the light of evidence to be hereafter reviewed, we are justified in an inference that one of the causes was a theft of the manuscript from the publisher's office, followed, perhaps, within a few weeks or months, by the death of Spaulding, which occurred in October, 1816.

Erroneous Theories Examined

It has been a theory among some that Joseph Smith himself secured the Spaulding manuscript from the house of William H. Sabine of Onondago Valley, N. Y., for whom Smith worked as a teamster in 1823.³⁷ According to another theory, Sidney Rigdon, while the "Manuscript Found" was at the printing office, copied it, the original being returned to Spaulding. A third theory supposes

Smith to have copied it while working for Sabine about 1823, leaving the original there. A fourth theory makes Spaulding copy his story for the publisher while keeping the duplicate at home to be afterward cared for by the family. Under all of these theories, the original of Spaulding's rewritten story was delivered in 1833 to D. P. Hurlburt to be used by E. D. Howe in his then forthcoming book, "Mormonism Unveiled," but, according to the Spaulding family, was by Hurlburt sold to the Mormons, and, according to the Mormons, destroyed by Hurlburt because wholly unlike the Book of Mormon. These theories can claim for themselves no greater weight than that, in the opinion of their several non-Mormon advocates, they furnish a possible explanation as to the connecting link between Spaulding and Smith, but upon all essentials, except one, are without any evidence which involves the conclusion deduced from it, and not one of these theories is necessary as an explanation for the established facts. The one element which has direct evidence in its support is the allegation that Spaulding's rewritten story of the "Manuscript Found" was, after Spaulding's death, in the possession of his widow. That allegation rests upon the following statement of Spaulding's daughter, Mrs. McKinstry, and the family belief in it without any additional evidence upon which to base that belief. She says:

"In 1816 my father died at Amity, Pa., and directly after his death my mother and myself went to visit my mother's brother, William H. Sabine, at Onondago Valley, Onondago County, N. Y. . . . We carried our personal effects with us, and one of these was an old trunk in which my mother had placed my father's writings, which had been preserved. I perfectly remember the appearance of this trunk, and of looking at its contents. There were sermons and other papers, and I saw a manuscript about an inch thick, closely written, tied with some of the stories my father had written for me, one of which he called the 'Frogs of Wyndham.' On the outside of this manuscript were written the words, 'Manuscript Found.' I did not read it, but looked through it and had it in my hands many times and saw the names I had heard at Conneaut when my father read it to his friends. I was about eleven years old at this time."³

The trunk remained at Sabine's until some time soon after 1820,³⁹ while in 1823 Smith is said to have worked for Sabine as a teamster, and almost certainly heard Spaulding's stories discussed as a matter of family history. If the rewritten story of Spaulding's "Manuscript Found" had been in the trunk at Sabine's while Smith worked there, which is doubtful, he might have stolen it or copied it, though the latter is made almost impossible by Smith's inability to write,⁴⁰ and by his youth.

Assuming, for the sake of argument, that it has been established that the Book of Mormon is a plagiarism from Spaulding's rewritten story, then we may still doubt that any of the above theories have sufficient evidence to warrant their acceptance as established facts. These various theories were all invented because of a supposed necessity of accounting for the alleged presence of the rewritten "Manuscript Found" in the trunk at Sabine's house after 1816, the date of Spaulding's death. If the "Manuscript Found" was never there, the theories constructed to explain that fact must fall.

That the first outline of the story which is now at Oberlin was then in the trunk is certain, because Hurlburt, in 1834, found it there. It is even possible that this first manuscript may at some time have been labeled "Manuscript Found." But was the rewritten story ever in the trunk at Sabine's? If not, Smith could neither have stolen it nor copied it, and, if never there, or if stolen by Smith, Hurlburt could not have secured that rewritten manuscript and sold it to the Mormons, as it has been charged he did do, while he gave only the first manuscript to Howe, by whom he was employed to secure another. It may not be amiss to here state that Howe never doubted Hurlburt's fidelity in this matter.⁴¹

The great preponderance of the evidence is against the allegation that the second manuscript was ever in the trunk at Sabine's. Mrs. McKinstry's evidence does not

establish the identity of Spaulding's rewritten "Manuscript Found" and the trunk manuscript. Such assertion of identity is contradicted by that more satisfactory evidence to be hereafter reviewed, and which shows that the rewritten manuscript was stolen from the printing office before Spaulding's death; that the latter suspected Rigdon of being the thief; the possession of Rigdon of some such manuscript, and which, on one occasion, he said had been written by Spaulding; Rigdon's advance knowledge of the forthcoming Book of Mormon and his sudden conversion after its appearance, and coupled with a very plain connection between Rigdon and Smith through Parley P. Pratt as intermediary. These conclusions and much of the evidence upon which they are based will contradict Mrs. McKinstry's statement, if she meant by it to assert that the Sabine trunk manuscript contained the names "Mormon," "Moroni," "Lamanite," and "Nephi," which names, it will be shown, occur in and only in the rewritten manuscript and the Book of Mormon.

In determining what weight to give to Mrs. McKinstry's statement as to the contents of the trunk manuscript, several important facts must be kept in mind. Mrs. McKinstry made this statement in 1880, when she was seventy-four years of age. Her father died in October, 1816, very soon after she and the trunk went to Sabine's at Hartwick, Onondaga County, N. Y., and there she "many times" had it in her hand. At the earliest date this must have been in the fore part of 1817, and she tells us that she was about eleven years old at this time. If, in 1817, she was eleven years old, then, in 1812, when she, with her parents, left Conneaut for Pittsburg, she could not have exceeded six years of age. At the age of seventy-four Mrs. McKinstry testified that when she was eleven years old she looked through, but did not read, a manuscript, yet saw the names she heard her father read at Conneaut, between 1810 and 1812, when she was from four to six years old.

That this woman, at seventy-four, should remember strange names, casually repeated in her presence, before her sixth year, and those names wholly unrelated to anything of direct consequence to her child life, is a feat of memory too extraordinary to give her uncorroborated statement any weight, as against valid contradictory conclusions drawn from established facts.

From 1834, when this alleged plagiarism was first publicly charged, until the giving of Mrs. McKinsty's evidence in 1880, it had necessarily been a matter of frequent discussion in the family circle that the Book of Mormon was a plagiarism from her father's "Manuscript Found," and always the identity of names must have been spoken of as the connecting link in the chain of evidence proving the plagiarism, since that identity of names was the principal item of evidence as it was first argued and published in 1834. With like uniformity, it was firmly believed (but as a mere matter of inference, be it remembered) that Hurlburt secured from the trunk that second manuscript, which contained these names. Hence it would be inferred by the Spaulding family that the trunk must have contained the names in question. This association of ideas through an almost infinite number of recurrences in mind became firmly impressed as a fixed fact during these forty-six years of frequent repetition. It is not strange, therefore, if, after these forty-six years, and with the failing memory of the age of seventy-four, Mrs. McKinsty should have forgotten the real origin of this association of ideas, and relate it back to the supposed inspection of the trunk manuscript and the Conenaut readings, honestly believing in her accuracy. In this conclusion Mormon authorities concur.⁴²

The only other statement which has ever been claimed as evidence showing Spaulding's rewritten manuscript to have been in the Sabine trunk is one by his widow, Matilda Spaulding-Davidson. She says that before leaving Pittsburg for Amity, her husband's manuscript was returned

by the publishers. She seemingly remembers nothing of its second submission while her husband resided at Amity, or else those who wrote and signed her statement didn't see fit to mention it. "The Manuscript then [after Mr. Spaulding's death in 1816] fell into my hands, and was preserved carefully. It has frequently been *examined by my daughter*, Mrs. McKinstry of Monson, Mass., with whom I now reside, and by other friends."⁴³

By what follows, she makes it plain that the "other friends" referred to are the Conneaut neighbors, whose examination was made prior to 1812, and not at Sabine's. That she herself never examined the Sabine trunk manuscript so as to speak upon the matter of identity of manuscripts from personal knowledge, is apparent from several facts. First, although writing an argumentative article, the strongest part of which would have been her personal testimony as to some point of identity between the trunk manuscript and the Book of Mormon, she mentioned none such as being within her own knowledge. In the absence of personal knowledge, she repeats as a justification of her belief the evidence of Conneaut witnesses as to the identity of her husband's "Manuscript Found" and the Book of Mormon. Even upon the question of the existence of any manuscript in the Sabine trunk, she seems not to rely upon any personal inspection of the trunk manuscript, but with an apparent intention of putting the responsibility for her statement upon the inspection of her daughter, Mrs. McKinstry, speaks of the latter's inspection, while remaining silent as to whether or not she made any inspection of her own.

The argumentative style and the failure to distinguish between personal knowledge and argumentative inferences is all readily understood when the history of this statement is made known. It seems that two preachers, named D. R. Austin and John Storrs, are responsible for this letter. Mrs. Davidson never wrote it, but afterwards stated that

"in the main" it was true.⁴⁴ Even with her re-affirmance of the story as published, we cannot give it evidentiary weight except in those matters where it is plain from the nature of things that she must have been speaking from personal knowledge.

Upon the question as to whether or not Spaulding's rewritten manuscript was in the possession of anybody but Rigdon at any time after October, 1816, Mrs. Davidson's statement as published cannot in any sense whatever be considered as evidence. And since Mrs. McKinstry's unsupported evidence, for the reasons already given, must be considered as of such very infinitesimal weight, I conclude that there is no believable evidence upon which to base the conclusion that the "Manuscript Found" was ever returned to Spaulding after its second submission to Patterson, or was ever in the trunk at Sabine's, and therefore, could not have been either copied or stolen by Smith. This also answers one Mormon argument made against Rigdon's theft of the manuscript from the printing office, which argument is always based upon the assumption that the original manuscript of the rewritten story was in the Sabine trunk long after the time of the alleged theft by Rigdon.

NOTES.

1. Valuable contributions to this study are Lamb's "Golden Bible" and a pamphlet by Lamoni Call classifying two thousand corrections in the inspired grammar of the first edition of the Book of Mormon.

2. The best effort along this line is Riley's "The Founder of Mormonism." To me the conclusions are very unsatisfactory, because so many material considerations were overlooked by that author.

3. President Fairchild, in the *New York Observer* for February 5, 1885, that being immediately after his discovery of the Oberlin Manuscript, says: "The theory of the origin of the Book of Mormon in the traditional manuscript of Solomon Spaulding will probably have to be relinquished.

... Mr. Rice, myself, and others compared it with the Book of Mormon, and could detect no resemblance between the two in general or detail.

... Some other explanation of the origin of the Book of Mormon must be found, if an explanation is required." (Reproduced in Whitney's *History of Utah*, 56. Talmage's "Articles of Faith," 278.)

Ten years later Mr. Fairchild is not so brash in assuming the Oberlin Manuscript to be the only Spaulding Manuscript, and he certifies only that the Oberlin Manuscript "is not the original of the Book of Mormon."

(Letter dated Oct. 17, 1895, published in vol. lx., *Millennial Star*, p. 697, Nov. 3, 1898. Talmage's "Articles of Faith," 279.)

Fairchild's Latest Statement.—In 1900 President Fairchild wrote the Rev. J. D. Nutting as follows:

"With regard to the manuscript of Mr. Spaulding now in the library of Oberlin College, I have never stated, and know of no one who can state, that it is the only manuscript which Spaulding wrote, or that it is certainly the one which has been supposed to be the original of the Book of Mormon. The discovery of this MS. does not prove that there may not have been another, which became the basis of the Book of Mormon. The use which has been made of statements emanating from me as implying the contrary of the above is entirely unwarranted.

"JAMES H. FAIRCHILD."

4. The *Deseret News* editorially says this on July 19, 1900:

"The discovery of the manuscript written by Mr. Spaulding, and its deposit in the library at Oberlin College, O., . . . has so completely demolished the theory once relied upon by superficial minds that the Book of Mormon was concocted from that manuscript, that it has been entirely abandoned by all opponents of Mormonism except the densely ignorant or unscrupulously dishonest."

And this on May 14, 1901:

"It is only the densely ignorant, the totally depraved, and clergymen of different denominations afflicted with anti-Mormon rabbies, who still use the Spaulding story to account for the origin of the Book of Mormon."

5. See Addendum to Spaulding Manuscript at Oberlin College and Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 288.

6. Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 288.

7. Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 283, 4, 6, 7.

8. "Memoirs of Stephen Burroughs," p. 26, ed. of 1811, shows Burroughs to have entered Dartmouth in 1781, which must have been Spaulding's date of entry, he having graduated in 1785.

9. "New Light on Mormonism," 261.

10. xxxv. *Saints' Herald*, 820.

11. Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 285.

12. "Prophet of Palmyra," 443; Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 279 and 282; "New Light on Mormonism," 13.

13. Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 279; "New Light on Mormonism," 13-14.

14. Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 284; "New Light on Mormonism," 20.

15. "New Light on Mormonism," 14.

16. "The Manuscript Found." For Howe's synopsis see "Mormonism Unveiled," 288. Whitney's "History of Utah," 49-51.

17. "New Light on Mormonism," by Mrs. Ellen F. Dickinson.

18. Publisher's Preface to "The Manuscript Found;" iv. *Deseret News*, July 19, 1900; i. Whitney's "History of Utah," p. 49; Talmage's "Articles of Faith," 278-9.

19. Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 288; i. Whitney's "History of Utah," 49.

20. Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 288.

21. "The Spaulding Story Examined and Exposed," by John E. Page, 7; "Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 7; "Mormonism Exposed," by Williams.

22. xxxv. *Saints' Herald*, 130; "Prophet of Palmyra," 459.

23. Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 288.
24. Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 283.
25. Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 282-3.
26. "New Light on Mormonism," 16-17; "History of the Mormons," 43; "Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 7.
27. "Gleanings by the Way," 252; "Mormon's Own Book," 29; "Prophet of Palmyra," 419; "History of the Mormons," 43.
28. Washington (Pa.) *Reporter* of April 21, 1869; "Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 6.
29. Gregg's "Prophet of Palmyra," 441-2.
30. "New Light on Mormonism," 239; *Magazine American History*, June, 1882; *Scribner's Monthly*, August, 1880; "Prophet of Palmyra," 423.
31. "Mormonism Exposed," by Williams, 16; "Prophet of Palmyra," 455; "The Spaulding Story Examined and Exposed," by John E. Page, 7.
32. Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 287; "Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 7.
33. "Prophet of Palmyra," 441, 442.
34. Reddick McKee in Washington (Pa.) *Reporter*, April 12, 1869; "Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 6.
35. "Prophet of Palmyra," 442-55.
36. "Prophet of Palmyra," 419-42; iii. *Millennial Harbinger*, about May, 1839; *Boston Recorder* during May, 1839; "Mormon's Own Book," 29.
37. "Hand Book on Mormonism," 3; "Braden-Kelly Debate," 47 and 118.
38. "New Light on Mormonism," 238; *Magazine of American History*, June, 1882; *Scribner's Monthly*, August, 1880.
39. "New Light on Mormonism," 238; "Braden-Kelly Debate," 118.
40. ii. *Journal of Discourses*, 197.
41. Under date of September 12, 1879, E. D. Howe wrote to R. Patterson saying, "I am very certain he (Hurlburt) never had any Manuscript Found to sell to anybody. Whatever Mormons may say, I think Hurlburt was perfectly honest in all his transactions here." (Taken from a copy of the letter furnished by Patterson in his *History of Washington County, Pa.*)
42. "Myth of the Manuscript Found," 29.
43. *Boston Daily Advertiser*, copied in iii. *Millennial Harbinger*, May, 1839; "Mormon's Own Book," 28; *Boston Recorder*, May, 1839; "Prophet of Palmyra," 417.
44. *Quincy Whig*, quoted in "The Spaulding Story Examined and Exposed," 5, to be read in connection with "Gleanings by the Way," 261-7. On p. 22 of the "Myth of the Manuscript Found" this interview appears with the statement that the *Boston Recorder* article was in the main true carefully omitted. For still more gross dishonesty see "Apostle" (afterward Prophet) John Taylor's lying perversion of this alleged interview as reported in his "Three Nights' Public Discussion," pp. 45 and 46. The dishonesty of the original publication of this interview is pointed out in "Gleanings by the Way," 261-4.

(To be continued.)

THE INFLUENCE OF THE FRENCH IN THE SETTLEMENT OF NORTH AMERICA.

BY MRS. C. F. MC LEAN.

IN considering the influence of the French in the settlement of North America, there occurs a natural division of the subject, viz: the influence of the French colonies on contemporary and immediately succeeding events, which, down through the endless chain that unites the present with the past, has modified even existing conditions in our own country; and second, a consideration of those more direct influences which today we can clearly recognize as active principles in our political and social life.

It is one of the tragic truths of history that the French, in many quarters of the world, have been the discoverers, even the first colonizers, but that as a government and a nationality they have been displaced, and other governments, other people, have reaped the benefit of their genius, valor, and endurance, and even of their martyrdom—have reaped where in blood and tears the French sowed the first seeds that, in ripening, gave security to civilized man and his commercial enterprises. Such was the history of the French and English in India, such has been, in part at least, their history in South Africa, the unfolding of whose bloody drama the world has recently watched with keenest interest. It was in the greatest measure and the widest extent the history of the colonization of North America.

We must recall that almost up to our own times the sources whence came our knowledge of the earliest periods

of American history were English, and if ever a race has been its own most glowing chronicler, with a disregard to any sense of justice to other races opposing their march of conquest, that race has been the English. Therefore from our earlier conceptions of our beginnings as a people we have been taught to very lightly consider the French colonists of North America, and have received a general notion that by Providence they were permitted to settle in America in order that the great valor of the English might be shown forth in overcoming and displacing them.

However, there has arisen in our own country—a fact of which we can not be too proud—a group of historians who are blinded neither by sectarian bigotry nor national prejudice, men who as Americans desire to render justice to all the different peoples who sought a home in the primeval wilderness of North America then inhabited by wild animals and savage races of men. These historians have patiently sought through babbling chronicles for the great historical truths there often to be discovered more by inference than direct statement, have searched the archives of various national governments and municipalities, and have brought forth the truth in that clear perspective which only a certain distance in time can give to historical events. Such historians now give us a truer sense of proportion of the various influences which have made our marvelous history—whence we have emerged, whether in New York or Louisiana, Canada or California, a distinct people.

As regards the history of the French in North America, reference is to the historian Parkman, who in his series of volumes on that subject has accomplished for that portion of our national history what Irving and Prescott had achieved for earlier epochs.

One of the historical events of Europe that bore with great force and far reaching influence on our earliest history was the reform within the Roman Catholic Church, which closely followed the Protestant reformation. The vows and

visions of Loyola reached far beyond his cell, and their influence extended to the remotest corners of the earth. As is generally the case in any violent political or religious reaction, this pendulum of clerical reform swung far back; the type of devotee in the church of Rome became again that of the days of the crusades. That type gave to America the most intrepid explorers and its most exalted martyrs: Samuel de Champlain and Chanoday de Maison Neuve, the first two governors of New France, were pure and brave knights of the cross, and in the howling wilderness of the new world kept their vows as faithfully as if immured in monastery cell, while their religious desires encompassed the conversion of the savage tribes as well as the care of those Breton and Norman fishermen who yearly sailed to the fishing banks of Newfoundland and returned with laden vessels to France.

Champlain, of all white men, first penetrated into the interior of North America: far south, far west, and far northwest of the feeble settlements on the St. Lawrence; he it was who discovered and made known to the civilized world that great chain of inland seas, cataracts, and rivers which, in their united extent, today are known as the greatest inland waterway in the world. Champlain first journeyed through the primeval wilderness of their shores, first of white men sailed their turbulent waters in frail birch bark canoe, shot the rapids of the rivers, and scrambled over the rocks of their cataracts. In journeying through the forests to the south into what is now the state of New York, Champlain first beheld the sparkling waters of the lake that yet bears his name.

In 1673 Marquette and Joliet, starting from far away Michilimackinac, discovered the Mississippi and descended that river as far as the Illinois. In 1682 La Salle, also starting from the far northwest, sailed down the broad waters of the Mississippi to the Gulf. Returning to Canada and thence to France, this brave and persevering discov-

erer endeavored to reach the mouth of the Mississippi from the Gulf and there establish a colony to perpetuate his great discovery. Through the treachery of those opposed to him, but who were in command of the vessel, though not of the emigrants, he was landed on the shores of what is now known as Mutagorda Bay. The colony there established was wiped out of existence, it is not known when or how, because the intrepid La Salle, still determined to reach the mouth of the Mississippi, in traveling through the forests was foully murdered by men of his own party.

During these years of the discovery of the greater arteries of the interior of the continent, there was also continual exploring of tributary rivers and adjacent forests and prairies by a great number of daring members of the French colonies, both priests and laymen, the pioneer white traders. The object of the second class was the establishment of trading posts which would give them the monopoly of the valuable furs brought in by neighboring and far distant Indian traders. There were therefore missions, trading posts, and stockaded forts established by these French colonists as far north as Mackinac, on the Illinois River, far down the Mississippi and immediately south of the St. Lawrence, in the present states of Maine and New York. Of the devoted band of missionaries, many, when captured by hostile tribes of Indians, were subjected to excruciating tortures far worse than death. It was when the gentle and scholarly Jesuit Toques was being dragged a captive from Lake Erie across to the Hudson River that a white man first beheld the beautiful Lake George. Although crippled and scarred from previous tortures, and both hands frightfully maimed, he yet felt it his duty to record the discovery of the lake on pieces of birch bark, hoping that in some unexpected, providential way the record of his discovery would reach his superior in his convent of Normandie.

Of the *coureurs de bois*, the name given to the French traders who made long journeys into the interior of the for-

ests, and the records of whose exploits have come down to us in quaint song and story, the best known names are those of de L'hutt and Etienne de Breille.

Subsequent events, especially when considered in reference to others not under his control, prove that Champlain committed one grievous error. Desiring to protect the friendly Mohawks from an attack of their enemy, the Iroquois, he and his men aided their allies with their wonderful arquebuses, and it was their firearms which first awakened the frightful echoes of the forests. For an entire generation the defeated Iroquois nursed their sense of injury, bided their time, and then took their bloody revenge on peaceful colonists. During nearly a century, when each summer hundreds and even thousands of canoes descended the St. Lawrence, bearing Indians to trade at Montreal and Quebec, the French never sold gun or ammunition to the Indians; not until an Indian was a baptized convert and living in or near the missions, did he ever receive from his French instructors a gun. The Dutch traders of Albany were less far sighted, and it was from them that the savage Iroquois obtained the weapons that in the warfare they subsequently waged against the French colonists made them nearly equal to their civilized antagonists. When these savages were thus equipped they began war on the converted and friendly Indians of the French missions, and they never entirely ceased their warfare until they had destroyed or scattered the Indians friendly to the French, and had added a long and dazzling list to the martyrs of the church of Rome. In the days fraught with danger to their own settlements the Dutch bitterly repented that they had not been as far-seeing as the French. In another century it took all the genius of a Frontenac to hold in check the floods of Indian invasion and to preserve the colonies on the St. Lawrence from the extinction attempted by the Iroquois.

Those of the French explorers not bound by their vows of celibacy married Indian women, and it has been abund-

antly proved that these squaws were far better treated than is usual in such unions of a dominant race with a savage people. There came, therefore, into honorable existence a distinct race of half-breeds, whose Indian instincts were supplemented by an additional intelligence which made them great and almost necessary factors in the further discovery and settlement of the northwest. The Indian blood has long since been bleached out of their descendants, but their peculiar forest lore and adaptability to the surroundings of the unbroken wilderness still remain with them. Of other half-breeds, that is, those born of other than French fathers, it has been recorded that often they out-savaged the savages in their warfares on the whites; such was an infamous chief of the Iroquois called the Flemish Bastard, so brilliantly reincarnated by Doyle in "The Refugees."

Parkman sums up the influence on the North American Indian of the different races that settled here as follows: "Spanish civilization crushed the Indian, English civilization scorned and neglected him, French civilization alone embraced and cherished him."

We must therefore clearly bear in mind that while the feeble colonies of the Dutch and English were clinging to the coast lines of the Atlantic, and with their rivers and harbors and ships were within reach of comparative safety, from the colonies along the St. Lawrence there were pushing far into the interior, around our Great Lakes, our rivers and cataracts, through trackless wilderness, and down widening, turbulent rivers, men not only of valor and possessed with the insatiable thirst of discovery and adventure, but also those whose first and consuming desire was the conversion and civilization of those savage tribes whose courage in war was equalled only by their ferocity in conquest. During more than a century these outlying missions of the French, with their peaceful civilizing influence on the converted Mohawks and other friendly tribes, formed a com-

plete wall of protection, not only for the French colonies on the St. Lawrence, but also for the Dutch and English colonies to the south and east of them.

Whatever be our religious views today, surely we must be less than human if, unmoved, we read the record of the sufferings and martyrdom of Recollet friar and Jesuit father, and short-sighted indeed are we if we do not perceive the far-reaching benefits of their labors in behalf of all civilization. In an account of the rebukes of the Jesuit teachers given to some of their Algonquin converts who, in their backsliding, desired to celebrate a victory a little in Indian fashion, Parkman adds: "This is far from being the only incident proving that in teaching the dogmas and observances of the Catholic Church the missionaries taught also the morals of Christianity." Nor did this influence end with the tribes directly under the instruction and guidance of the missionaries: its powerful influence extended far beyond the circle of converts. It eventually modified and softened the manners of many unconverted tribes. The ferocity of the earlier century of the settlement was in the second century perceptibly modified. It was to the French priests and colonists, mingled as they were during more than a century among the tribes of the vast interior, that the change is chiefly to be ascribed. We see, therefore, that these French missionaries and colonists were the sentinels on the borderland of civilization, and bravely, steadily did they stand at their post—"faithful unto death."

To what, then, are we to ascribe the failure of such colonists as the French undoubtedly proved themselves to be, to secure on the continent, away from the seacoast which they first explored, a permanent and distinct national existence? Not to themselves, but to the vicious government of an absolute monarchy, the unholy alliance of church and state, always degrading to the church and stultifying to the state, a government that carried out to the utmost the principle that colonies existed not for the benefit and hap-

piness of the colonists themselves, but to furnish posts of honor and emolument to court favorites and opportunities for repairing the fortunes of dissolute spendthrifts. The statesmanship—Heaven save the mark—of the king's dressing-room made the failure of the colonies of New France to maintain a separate existence. Left to themselves, entirely free from the wicked strife between two great races, stirred up and decided by the dissolute mistresses of hypocritical kings, and carried on solely for the advancement of their favorites, there would have been peaceful relations between the various colonies of North America and a union for their common defense against savage tribes, which would have resulted not only in their safety but to their mutual and incalculable benefit. Already a Jesuit envoy from the government of the French colonies had been received by the authorities of Boston, had been housed by the missionary Elliott, and thus there were then under one roof two good men of wide variance of belief but of kindred soul—when to the blasting of all the better prospects of all the colonies of North America war came to them. If we could divest ourselves of the national prejudice which comes to us because Washington then took part with the English, we would acknowledge that if discovery and first settlement gave clear title, the French then had a better right to the fort above the Ohio than the English could rightfully claim.

On the authority of no less a judge than Lord Russell, the late chief-justice of England, we are led to believe that the influence of the French population of Canada has been an all pervading one, for he has stated that the subjects of the British empire are there governed by laws older than those of Rome, by customs and laws that have come down from the days when the Gauls were the inhabitants of France. Profiting by her experience in other colonies, England has pursued a wiser policy toward her remaining North American possessions, and to that policy the mild influence of the

descendants of the French has contributed not a little. Today we can say that in Sir Wilfred Laurier have been epitomized the genius and best qualities of the race that first settled in Canada.

It is not the intention to in any way belittle the English settlers of North America; but although we must all give due meed of homage to the Puritan fathers and their wonderful history, their great desire to secure religious freedom for themselves (and while they banished the Baptists, persecuted the Quakers, and burned the witches, they were nevertheless the chosen people to finally secure religious and civil liberty, let us hope not only for their descendants but for the world), yet we must acknowledge that were we of today transported back in time to live with them we would find existence a very solemn affair. No one can live in France and then go to England without being impressed with the burden of solemnity the English give to life. That we as Americans differ essentially and agreeably from the English in all our community and social life is an undeniable fact, and that we do so is owing to the influence of other nationalities that have contributed to make us a people, and most largely to the influence of the French. Wherever on this continent they have stepped, however lightly they have trod, we can yet trace their footprints; from the French in Canada, from the the French of Louisiana, from even the few who remained about Detroit and St. Louis, their influence has crept silently but deeply into our life. Whenever there has been opened a park where its object is to rejoice the eye with trees and grass and flowers; wherever there has risen a graceful statue of his country's defender, or, as in the case of the statue of Margaret at New Orleans, a statue of an example of faith and charity; wherever in our cities there are ice palaces and snow carnivals; wherever Mardigras processions and flower festivals awaken a love of beauty for beauty's sake—trace back their inspiration, we come to the French. Trace our emancipa-

n from the belief that a meal is a solemn duty to the
a that it is not even reprehensible to make it a time of
cial enjoyment, trace our present notions that it is even
se to desire well cooked food to be daintily served, and
i reach out to the influence of the descendants of the
rench settlers.

Intendant and governor, the blighting influence of a cor-
pt and degenerate aristocracy, have all been swept away
om America; but the brightening, refining influence of a
ople who have contributed their full share to the progress
civilization yet remains with us and fully asserts itself
our own progress and betterment.

NEW YORK IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BY JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS.

Fourth Paper.

CHANGES IN POPULATION AND INDUSTRIES—THE CIVIL WAR
AND ITS CONSEQUENCES—NEW YORK A COSMOPOLIS.

1850—75.

(From a historical address.)

THE first half of the century was closed. It has been shown with what pride in the past and what hope in the future the chroniclers and historians described its achievements, a part of which they were. Entering upon the study of the second half of the century, I am thrown upon my own resources, depend on my own research and the lessons of my own experience.¹

In many ways the years from 1850 to 1875 are more full of interest, and their study conveys more lessons of value, than any others in our history. They were the years of the enormous immigration from the western nations of Europe, which by its very mass and suddenness modified the character of our population, and without the unifying agency of the Civil War might have brought to us some of the miseries and dangers of foreign capitals. But service and danger in a common cause do more to weld together oppo-

¹The reader is referred to the "Progress in New York in a Century," a historical paper prepared by me for the New York Historical Society in 1876, in which I had the advantage of the exhaustive library of the Society as well as the invaluable aid of its late librarian, Mr. William Kelby, who has been aptly styled a "living compendium" of New York history.

site elements than any other agency. The nature of that immigration and the relative values of its parts deserve a serious and somewhat extended study.

In the third quarter of the century New York, which had shown a cosmopolitan spirit from its earliest days in its laws, its disposition, and its habits, became in fact, by an enormous inflow of people from every nation in Europe, including men from countries until then wholly unrepresented here, the most cosmopolitan city of western civilization. Moreover, it had added to its population numbers from the countries of the far east. In truth no city in Europe could then or can today compare with it in the variety and numbers of citizens of birth alien to its own. There has been nothing like it since Rome, during the "Roman peace." Moscow is the great world's capital of Europe, where eastern and western civilizations meet—the Chinese Tartar and the Cossacks of the steppes mingling at the annual mart with the Slavonic and Scandinavian and other European peoples; a strange medley without national instinct or bond of union except their attachment to the Czar. As a world's capital there is no city on the globe which compares with New York, unless it be San Francisco, which is already a metropolis and promises, through our expansion by manifest destiny and commercial enterprise, to become the cosmopolitan city of the Pacific slope.

I shall attempt to describe some of the characteristics of this great alien part of our population and to show its gradual assimilation into that new American race of which New York today presents the best expression.

Irish Population.—When the Irish element of New York population is named it is naturally the Roman Catholic part that is meant. The Protestant Irishman, though Irish-born, is rarely of Celtic origin, but usually a descendant of the lowland Scotch—their own of English stock—and of the English of the western border who were settled in the north of Ireland as a Protestant check to French

aggression with native Irish aid. This Scotch-Irish race has its representatives in New York, but not of it do we think when speaking of the Irish-American who has been gradually changing in character and in outward show under the free development of our national institutions. These influences again have been supplemented by the large help of our state institutions to his free education—a necessary consequence of our universal suffrage which compels capital to educate labor; and further by his early and unrestrained admission into the ranks of political parties. For the political field it must be acknowledged that the Irishman has a wonderful aptitude. Chafe as he may at any other control, he is the obedient servant of the boss. Though without benefit or injury to himself, he glories in the triumph or mourns the defeat of his party, and, faithful always, he pays subservient homage to his chiefs, from the boss down to the ward leader, through every rank of the political hierarchy. "*Poeta nascitur non fit*," says the old adage, and true it is of the Irishman as a politician.

In the second quarter of the century all of the domestic and many of the outdoor employments in our city were monopolized by the negro; when coachmen, cooks, waiters, barbers, oystermen, bootblacks, even cartmen and stevedores, were blacks. Mulattos were few, miscegenation being rare north of Mason and Dixon's line. The prejudice of the Irish against the black, which reached a dangerous height at a later period, was not a native but an acquired one. They did not bring it with them from Ireland, they learned it here. It was a political, not a race prejudice, and it was fostered by their party leaders, who, taking advantage of their ignorance, held their votes by assuring them that it was the purpose of the anti-slavery men to bring up the southern negro to take their employments.

This monopoly of domestic employment the negro continued to hold until the great Irish immigration of the close of the second and during the third quarter of the century.

Then the negro was pushed out, and the Irishman gradually took his place; until the last of the negro servant who marshalled his hosts at the hotel tables, and the negro hall-boy who played popular tunes with his whisk-broom on your coat sleeves as he asked for his tip, are now, in the north at least, only to be met with at our summer resorts, Saratoga and Sharon.

Not only did the Irishman (and more particularly the Irish woman) usurp the domestic functions, but, lord of the spade, the shovel, and the hod, always preferring the city to the country and clinging to the line of the railroads, he became in New York the chief factor in its physical development. In the second quarter of the century it was he who built the railroad and the aqueduct, who made the sewers, paved the streets, and was at the same time the political tool of his employer, blindly voting the boss's ticket for fear should he disobey he would lose his job, not seeing that there was no competitor in the field. This was the normal social condition of the great Irish colony in New York, of that first immigration which, moderate before the Irish famine, after the potato rot in 1844 took on enormous proportions, nearly one million of this race being landed at Castle Garden in the decade 1850-60. The Civil War arrested the influx in part, but still it continued on a large scale, reaching in the United States over 901,000 in the twenty years from 1861 to 1880, about equally divided between the two decades.

It must not be forgotten that the Irish immigrant today no longer finds the same conditions as those found one or two generations before him. As a factor in the race fusion he has become smaller; he encounters a powerful competition in the immigration of other races. But beyond all other races he is the best immigrant. He assimilates faster with the population; he finds and makes an easy graft, which takes the characteristics of the prevailing stock, modifying but not seriously changing it. This is because of his

Celtic blood, which like the Gallic has always easily blended with that of other races.

German Population.—The German immigration in large numbers began at about the same period as the Irish, but was the outcome of another cause—the political disturbances of Europe in 1848. From this source also a million of people came to the United States in the decade from 1850 to 1860. The Civil War did not materially affect this movement, which again reached unprecedented figures in the last quarter of the century. Today it is estimated that the Germanic race has twice as many representatives in New York City as the Irish.

The Germans of course quickly took their share of lucrative work, generally, however, of a higher order than that of the Irish. They became the grocers, tailors, and small tradesmen of the city, while the American-born monopolized the higher art of the mechanic.

It seems at first surprising that the German element, while greater in amount, has not the political power of its Irish rival. Yet the reasons are simple. First, because in his ignorance of our language, to the German the name "Democrat" has been found a shibboleth hard to overcome. Second, because our patent reformers, forgetting that the German, while Protestant like themselves, is of the Lutheran faith, which allows what is now called an open Sunday—and encourages rather than discourages reasonable amusements on that day—have attempted to restrict his inherited personal liberty in this regard. "Divide and rule" is the theory of the bosses, and thus far it has served them well in practice. Holding the Irish vote always, they win over the discontented Teutons.

Precisely as the Irish, a race shiftless at home and wasteful in their own environment, were pushed from a large field of employment by the incoming Germans with their economy and thrift; so have the Germans in their turn been compelled to relinquish many of their occupations to

the Italians, who are quite as hard workers and even more thrifty than themselves.

Until the middle of the last century the old seat of the German colony was the Eighth Ward between the Bowery and the East River. But soon after that period there was a great movement to Eighth avenue about and above Chelsea, where the German colonization doubled the value of lots in a few years. Today, while they still continue in this neighborhood, they have also made a large settlement above and below that fine thoroughfare, One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street, which, bright as day with its electric lights, its markets and fruit shops open, and its mass of people crossing and recrossing the broad avenue, presents of a Saturday evening one of the gayest scenes in the city, reminding one on a larger scale of what Maiden Lane was of a frosty Christmas Eve, with snow on the ground, more than half a century ago.

Jewish Population.—In the changes in the character of our population no fact is more striking than the great increase in the number of Jews. It is estimated on Jewish authority—and there is no other so reliable—that the Jewish population of the United States at the beginning of the year 1900 was 1,043,800, of whom New York had 400,000. Not less noticeable is the change in the residence centers of this branch of our people. In the early part of the century, when the little Mill Street structure was their only place of worship, the petty colony clustered about it. About the year 1825 the center was in Chatham Street and about Chatham Square, near their old cemetery. Their business was of an inferior kind, much after the order of their English Jewish parents—dealings in old clothes and second-hand furniture, a class of trade which they so monopolized that the name Chatham Street Jew was enough to designate their occupation, and the highest of the race did not aspire to money dealing beyond the barter and sale of coin and currency, the petty lottery, or the pawnshop.

Today Chatham Street has been deserted and Broadway invaded, until it is the wonder of the stranger, as he takes his first stroll up this typical New York thoroughfare, to see that a large, perhaps the largest number of the signs, bear Jewish names, no longer, however, English, but German. For since the time when the Sixth Legion took up from Rome their Jerusalem captives as slaves to the Germanic border of the empire, the Rhine Valley, with Frankfurt and Mayence as centers, has been the most fruitful field of Jewish propagation in western Europe. No longer is the ambition of the New York Jew limited to his former narrow occupation, but he has reached out into the largest enterprises, with great wholesale emporiums, where every domestic want can be satisfied. On Sixth Avenue, Fourteenth and Twenty-third Streets, their mammoth concerns are to be found, while, still holding the majority of the small retail trade, the Jew has reached out into enterprises of the most extensive kind. From selling old clothes he has become the greatest manufacturer of new clothes, and some of these large houses employ hundreds of hands and use as many sewing machines. From loaning on pawn-tickets and barter in petty coin, he has entered the larger field of money transaction and takes a high seat in the synagogue of finance; and as the nature and scene of his occupation have shifted, so also has his seat of residence. From the neighborhood of Laurens and Wooster to Crosby, where there was a new synagogue, the Jew has moved—no longer as an individual, but as a colony—to the fine eastern quarter above Fifty-ninth Street north, and from Lexington Avenue east, occupying whole blocks. With these changes of residence have come changes in habits also. Availing to the utmost of the free privileges, the children of the Jews almost without exception take the public school teaching and are distinguished for their attainments; and so also with the higher branches of education in our high schools and colleges. Equal in wealth and culture to his Gentile

neighbor, the Jew is no longer the pariah of society, and doors which at the beginning of the century were open to only a few of the very highest Jewish families of Spanish and Portuguese descent now give welcome admission to this long proscribed race.

When we look back from the present to the past pages of Jewish history, and learn from Josephus that in the time of Alexander and the first Ptolemy, when the Jews "as a nation flourished, Jerusalem was inhabited by one hundred and twenty thousand men or thereabouts," and again, when we examine the present estimates of the population of Palestine, which place it not in excess of four hundred thousand, of whom but one-tenth part are Jews, New York may well be called the "New Jerusalem." The Jews owed their first enfranchisement to the spirit of the French Revolution, but until nearly the middle of the nineteenth century they were locked up at night in Frankfurt (the *Juden Gasse*) and in Rome (the *Ghetto*). Of late there has sprung up in Paris and Vienna an intense anti-semitic prejudice. No such aversion to the religion of the Jew has ever manifested itself in New York. If any social distinction has existed it is of the Jew's own making, an outcome of his own inherited exclusiveness; and if there be a jealousy of his grasp at trade and wealth it is not of his successes, but that "he wants it all."

Italian Population.—The immigration of the Italians is essentially of the last quarter of the century, and it is estimated by good authority (the *Catholic Union*) that more than a million have landed at Castle Garden since 1850.

Until recently Mulberry Bend and Baxter Street have been the seat of this colony—"Little Italy," so called,—and later they have clustered in force about their park at First Avenue and One Hundred and Twelfth Street, where, unlike the dingy dwellings in the Five Points neighborhood, their tenements are of stone. They are distinguished for their sobriety (especially the women), their untiring indus-

try and thrift, their cheerful disposition under all circumstances, and latterly an eagerness for the education of their children. At the public schools these are noted for attendance and ambition. As yet the Italian has not entered the higher fields of industry. It is noticeable that even in the inclement season he prefers the open-air occupations. He has usurped the bootblack industry and the street fruit stand, he takes kindly to the shovel and the broom, and he has but little if any religious prejudice.

French Population.—In the beginning of the century the French immigration was of a much higher class than at any period since. They came directly from France after the troubles of their Revolution, and from the West Indies after the negro uprisings at the close of the eighteenth century. They brought with them the science of modern cookery and have left their mark on the social life of the city. At the close of the first empire the exiles from France who made their homes here were of a more general character. In the second quarter of the century old officers of Napoleon were established in New York in commerce, and had always a monopoly of that higher education which included proficiency in mathematics and the languages. During that period the French colony held a distinctive and honorable position. It was estimated at about ten thousand. Following the Revolution of 1848 this immigration again changed in character. The Frenchman is not a colonist by nature, and rarely leaves his own country willingly. The periods of the largest immigration from France to the United States have been those succeeding the great social revolutions: in the decade 1841-50, and that which succeeded, 1851-60, it was 153,630, about equally divided between these periods. Small during our Civil War, it later reached its old proportions. The occupations of the French are varied, and in the main concerned with the luxuries of life. They are the waiters of the best hotels, the dressmakers, milliners, the ladies' maids, and are busy with many of the industries

which demand taste in design and nice handiwork in execution. The home center of this class was in the third quarter of the century the lower Fifth Avenue south of Washington Square.

Asiatic Population.—Although the number of immigrants from the far east, China and Japan especially, has not been great, yet the characteristics of these people are so distinctive that they are a marked feature in the city. The Chinese are not ambitious, but monopolize some branches of occupation; they do the laundry work of the city; they congregate about Mulberry Bend, where they are thick as Vallambrosa leaves. They are workers, inoffensive, thrifty, but are not a race to be encouraged, being in no way in touch with ourselves. The Japanese, on the other hand, have shown a strong desire to mingle with our population. They appear in every walk of life. They have a genius for trade and deserve their name—the Yankees of the east.

British Immigration.—In this summary examination of the elements of our population we must not forget the strengthening of the old stock by the incoming from branches of the British empire other than Irish, namely, England, Scotland, and Wales, which within the forty years, 1850-90, amounted to 2,429,970 against 2,471,682 Irish in the same period. (Total from the British Empire, 4,900,652.) So that on close inspection it is clear that we are not in danger of too far a departure from our original race standard, while from the influence of other races we may reasonably look for a progress during the coming century in more numerous ways. In the walks of science, practical and theoretical, and above all in the economy of domestic life, each race brings to us some new excellence which it is of our spirit readily to essay and if it prove worthy adopt. Out of this complex composite there will surely come a happier condition of life.

The beginning of the third quarter of the century was one

of unusual prosperity. The ocean steamers of the various lines were all running with full cargoes out and with full passenger lists home. The American packet ships were still sailing and were well patronized. Under the impulse of the steam lines the southern trade was fast increasing, the vessels running full and at times unequal to the demands upon them for freight or passage. The trade with Louisiana was also thriving, the sugar crops being large and profitable. Numerous new sugar refineries were established in the city, and great warehouses were built on the Brooklyn shore for the storage of this bulky article.

The year 1754 has been styled the Golden Age of the colonial period. All Europe was then at peace. With much more truth could the corresponding time in the nineteenth century be so called. Wherever the eye turned it saw signs of growing wealth. The output of gold from California was great beyond the wildest dreams, and such financiers as Chevalier were beginning to take alarm at the disturbance of the old ratio between the precious metals. French financiers, easily the foremost in the world, were the first to take advantage of this enormous addition to the gold supply. Silver, as Humbolt observed, had for "two thousand years moved from the west to the east," whence it never returned. A sudden demand springing up for the far east in 1855, France determined to rid herself of her silver, which until then had been the basis of her currency. In the single year 1858 Chevalier tells us Europe received one-tenth of the total amount sent from the departure of Columbus until 1848. The action of France served as a parachute to the otherwise inevitable fall of the ratio of gold and silver. In the year 1856 the Peninsula and Oriental Line transported silver to the value of over sixty millions of dollars, and in 1857 to that of nearly eighty-four millions; and in the ten years from 1851 to 1862 silver to the value of five hundred and fifty millions of dollars passed to India by the Isthmus of Suez.

In 1859 the sum of one hundred and thirty-nine millions of gold was added to the metallic capital of the United States, and there had been as yet no increase in the output of silver. The effect of the discoveries of silver deposits in Nevada and Colorado and the change in its respective ratio to gold must be noticed hereafter. Mr. Guthrie, secretary of the treasury, in 1854, estimated the specie in the country at one hundred and fifty-four millions of gold and silver, the amount of the latter being so small that a distinction was not yet made in the statement. The state bank circulation of this entire period hardly exceeded two hundred millions. Nevertheless, the enormous development of our mineral resources did not materially increase our stock of gold. With a continuous balance of trade against us and the unceasing European demand for gold, the net exports of that metal from 1855 to 1860 were three hundred million dollars. Yet the only check, even under these circumstances, to the financial prosperity of New York, was the money crisis of 1857, which was of a different nature from any that had preceded or that have followed it. Begun by the failure in New York of the Ohio Life and Trust Company, which in the unfortunate absence of any bankrupt law left its assets to the first attaching creditor, to the utter exclusion of all others, public confidence received a dreadful shock; the more as this company was largely interested in the western railroad system. But the real cause of the disaster which followed this failure was the imprudent advances of foreign banking houses to American borrowers in their desire to monopolize this branch of business. The real seat of over-speculation was London, and this speculation was a consequence, no doubt, of the expansion caused by the gold discoveries. When reaction came heavy failures in England brought a demand for the return of British capital from the United States by their agents

here.¹ A struggle was precipitated with the banks of New York to compel them to expand loans and thus relieve the foreign bankers here, and their British principals, from their load of advances. Finally, to force this conclusion, a combination was made to collect an amount of bills of weak banks, which, being suddenly presented, brought about their suspension. The large conservative institutions were also forced, though against their judgment, to suspend payments of specie, but as the liquidation was already thorough the premium on gold was merely nominal, and in a very short time the banks resumed without a flutter.

Dark days were, however, close at hand, and events occurred which were to have a lasting influence on the commerce of the world, to modify its whole monetary system, and to force the industries of New York into new channels. The long contest over the admission of slaves into the north-west territories culminated upon the nomination of Lincoln to the presidency. In New York the parting of the ways came at the great meeting, held at the Merchants' Exchange on Wall Street in October, 1860, in answer to the declaration of the southern statesmen that his election would not be submitted to. The winter which followed that election, with its attendant consequence of secession, was one of great excitement. New York as a whole favored the compromises urged at Washington, but the plans of the confederates were too mature for retreat. The assault on Fort Sumter closed all peaceful contention; only war remained. No event in our history, not even the excitement caused by the Lexington alarm, has ever equalled what Gasparin called the "Great Uprising." Merchants and bankers gathered at once in the hall of the Chamber of Commerce, and like their fathers of old pledged lives and fortunes to maintain the integrity of the nation and

¹The Bank of England raised its discount rate from five per cent. October 14, to nine per cent. November 8, 1857, and looked with disfavor on any withdrawals of coin even at these high rates.

the honor of the flag. Large sums were instantly subscribed by corporate institutions and individuals to sustain the government credit, and the blockade of the southern ports was demanded. This by a curious coincidence was on the nineteenth of April, the anniversary of the battle of Lexington. Nor can anyone who was in New York City on the memorable Saturday that followed ever forget that day. All business was suspended, and it seemed as though the entire city flocked to Union Square to pledge themselves in their turn. Here was kindled that patriotic spark which spread with electric flash to the farthest eastern homestead on the Atlantic coast and to the most distant cabin of the western prairie. And on this occasion perhaps the invention of Morse had its noblest use, uniting the nation in one electric throb.

The memory of the war is too recent, though a generation of man has since passed, to be here recalled. Its history is still fresh to their children. Enough for the present purpose to note the far-reaching changes the war caused. Precisely as in the earlier days of the century, the war in Europe had thrown the carrying trade of the world into our hands—a carrying trade again lost but regained by our own energies,—so once more by the operation of similar causes that carrying trade was stripped from us. Nor has this carrying trade been in any respect recovered on the ocean, except as far as it is coastwise. But this perhaps is not so much of a disaster as at first sight appears, and as our pessimists never weary of declaring it to be. Capital cannot serve two purposes at once, and it must be patent to any economic student that it has been more to the interest of the country at large, and certainly of New York City, that our railroad system should reach its perfect development, that no bale of cotton, no barrel of pork or of flour, no bushel of grain may remain in the interior for want of transportation to the seacoast. Certain it is that as we are the food producing country no article of our

product will ever lie at our wharves or in our warehouses for want of an ocean carrier. The day is close at hand, however, when with our great and increasing metallic stock, and with floating capital so abundant that it seeks investment abroad—in British, Russian, and Mexican loans for the first time in our history,—and when every material that enters into the construction of modern ships is cheaper in the United States than anywhere else in the world, we shall again with our old-time energy cover the oceans with our vessels and grasp our share of the steam carrying trade. Then again the marvels of our naval construction will bear the flag of our fathers to the utmost ends of the earth, and, as trade follows the flag, seize our full proportion of the commerce of nations.

At last peace came, and with it the sad martyrdom of that great and benign magistrate, who in our time was first in the hearts of his countrymen, and in all time next to Washington will hold the dearest place in the nation's memory. Another consequence of our Civil War was the redistribution of labor and capital. From its necessities sprang the rapid development of manufactories in our city. A vast army was to be clothed as well as fed, and the thousand needs which war creates were to be supplied. The change was so great that at its close we were easily the second manufacturing city, as we are today the first in the United States. Philadelphia outranks us perhaps in industries, but falls behind us in manufactures. The thousand petty articles on which the comfort of life depends, which before the war we took from abroad, are now made here, and to such an extent that the most skilled artisans in the world are attracted to this city and employed in this lucrative handiwork. And for the beauty and perfection of our output we challenge comparison with any nation in Europe, even in its own peculiar line. But all this wide development could not have been reached without a great expansion of our credit system. Fortunately the skilful

management of the treasury department, in which Mr. Chase had the constant advice and support of the managers of the New York banks, had kept the non-interest paying issues of the government within reasonable bounds. An effort was made in the beginning of the war to maintain specie payments. The associated banks of the seaboard cities together subscribed for a loan of one hundred and fifty millions in coin, a sum which by skilful management for a while served its purpose. But it was soon evident that there was not enough specie in the country to maintain the circle of collection and distribution in coin under the enormous demands of the treasury, and again for the fourth time in our history the banks suspended and the entire country passed to a paper basis. The gradual development of the national bank system, however, not only served to distribute the loans of the government, but was found equal to the daily business of the country.

There was no loss of specie during the war. Indeed, we were able to hold some part of our output, but with large importations at its close the balance of trade turned against us and again began its accustomed drain. The loss of gold was the first contraction. In 1865 the government began its policy of funding the various issues which had served the purpose of currency to meet the war demands; a policy which, pushed too far, brought about a serious disturbance of values, and caused the failure of one of the most extensive financial houses in the country, with widespread interior connections. Occurring in 1873, this suspension brought on what was called a panic, if such a name can be properly given to an individual liquidation of values which, under the contraction of the currency, could not be avoided; nor yet could the name panic be properly given to a condition of the money market in which the non-interest paying obligations of the government were at a premium. Yet in view of the determination of the treasury department to resume specie payment on the first of January, 1879, no

other course was perhaps open to it than the rigid policy it pursued. Its consequences reached far, and for the first time since 1837 real estate was affected.

The convulsion of 1874, in so far as it touched the value of real estate, was not the result of any over-estimate of or over-speculation in its values. It was no doubt precipitated by imprudent banking, but its immediate cause was that stringent contraction of the currency, which brought down the circulating medium from 1,341,000 millions in 1865 to 876,000 millions¹ in 1874, a contraction of forty per cent. Moreover, the turn of the balance of trade against us when the stock of gold was lower than it had been in a half century, and that of silver nearly nominal, caused a natural dread that the gold standard of value would disappear, and that, without even silver to fall back upon, we should again come to the evil days of paper money. In fact, in 1874 the value of real estate in New York had not changed, but its inconvertibility into money placed the holder of the realty at the mercy of the holder of the mortgage. Real estate holders came to grief, not because they had paid too high prices, but because they had discounted the future too far and carried more than they could hold.

The recovery was slow, but as gold values had been reached the circulating medium was secure. As the result, however, of this depression, the spirit of New York at the close of the third quarter of the century was somewhat chastened. Yet in its achievements in the hundred years that had elapsed from its declaration of independence there was no reason for undue affliction.

It would not be just to close the account of this period without a tribute to the high spirit of the people of New York during the the uncertain trials of the war. While

¹The government reported the amount of the circulating medium as follows: Paper money—United States treasury notes (Greenbacks), \$400,000,000, national bank notes, \$336,000,000; specie—gold, \$135,000,000, silver, \$5,000,000; total medium—paper, \$736,000,000, coin, \$140,000,000, altogether, \$876,000,000.

no doubt there was a powerful and dangerous element of opposition in the city, there was at the same time a set resolve on the part of the upper and middle class that this element should be held in strict check. Those best informed of the secret history of the draft riot of 1863 have never doubted that it was prompted from without and part in it was taken only by the least respectable of our population. Nor was it in any sense an uprising of our foreign population. On the contrary, the better part of both the Irish and German element who had taken their full share in the dangers and the triumphs of the earlier period stood aloof from this manifestation. Their regiments held the field, and held it with honor. The Irish brigade enlisted in the first year of the war, as did the German batteries of heavy artillery. The Mozart and Tammany regiments, exclusively democratic organizations, were among the earliest in the field.

Looking back over this interesting period, and that which immediately followed, the judgment must be made that the war was not even of temporary injury to the city. Perhaps no city was ever under similar conditions in a time of war. Immigration was at no period so checked that it did not suffice to fill up the gaps made by the absent. Indeed, it may be said that save as by its roll of death and disease it was brought home to individuals, the war was not felt as a suffering in this city, and that we emerged from it as populous, as wealthy, and as orderly as when it was declared. Its measureless results we have not ceased to experience.

The greatest advance in practical science during this period was the successful laying of the Atlantic Ocean cable. First laid in 1858, its one great service was the welcome news of "Peace with China." This message alone gave warrant that the enterprise would never be abandoned. Within twenty-four hours from its reception our merchantmen had set sail for the China ports, sure by their shorter line of voyage to outstrip their English competitors. The

first success of the cable was but temporary; broken and lost in the dark caverns of the deep it was picked up by the "Great Eastern" when laying a second cable in 1866, on the twenty-fifth day of July of which year instantaneous communication between the western and eastern hemisphere was permanently established. To an American and a New Yorker of New England birth, Mr. Cyrus W. Field, was this triumph due, and another glistening pearl added to the link of our achievements.

The Civil War had intervened. This also added another triumph when Erickson, with his "little cheese-box," the "Monitor," avenged on the grim monster, the "Merrimac," the destruction of the union men-of-war in the waters of the Potomac in 1862. Though a Swede by birth he had been for forty years a resident of our city.

And still another of the discoveries of this quarter of a century was Edison's application of electricity to the lighting of streets, public buildings, and dwellings. Of Ohio birth, he settled here while still in his first manhood, and here he perfected his invention in 1872. And it is but just to remark that Morse first made his electrical experiments at Castle Garden in 1835.

The greatest fortunes in New York up to 1875 were the result of the simple increase in values of what were once country estates or farms, without other care than their development, or in the investment of earnings from food industries, breweries, and refineries, in real estate, and the increase of that estate. And the cause is simple; every day's labor of the mechanic or the merchant adds to the development of the city, even though those engaged are themselves losers by that labor. But the value of property and the fortunes of those who own it, steadily increases in either case.

As has been stated, the taxable value of real estate in 1850 was a little over two hundred millions, a sum at the present day exceeded by that which the head of the

Astor family is credited as owning, this fortune being based on New York real estate.

In 1875 the official values of real and personal property in the city were: real, \$883,643,845; personal, \$217,300,154; total, \$1,100,943,699. To this must be added the amount exempt from taxation, roughly estimated at \$300,000,000. The United States census for 1870 shows the enormous increase in the manufactures. There were then 7,624 establishments, employing 129,577 hands and a capital of \$129,952,262, with an output of \$332,951,520. Besides this, in the fiscal year 1874, there were built 396 vessels, steam and sail, with a tonnage of 64,000. The population of the city, with the "annexed districts," was given by the state census of 1875 as 1,046,037 souls. Of the inhabitants in the city proper in 1870 (942,292), 419,094 were foreign born—234,594 British and Irish, and 151,216 German. The number of buildings was, January 1, 1876, 101,162. Of these 84,200 were dwellings; stores, stables, and markets, 16,438; public buildings, churches, etc., 524. The most important public improvement was the park system; of the 27,000 acres comprising the city proper, 1,007 acres were devoted to those open spaces, which have been properly termed "the lungs of the city." The Central Park, the chief of these, needs no mention; there is no park in any European city to be compared with it. It was essentially completed before 1860, but constant additions have been and are still being made to its ornament and attractiveness.

THE MORRIS FAMILY OF MORRISANIA.

BY W. W. SPOONER.

(Continued from p. 328.)

VI

Line of Lewis Morris the Signer (IV.)

COLONEL LEWIS MORRIS, son of Colonel Lewis and Anne (Elliott) Morris, was born in Charleston, S. C., March 10, 1785; died at Adam's Run, S. C., September 30, 1863.

Married, 1st, July 13, 1807, Elizabeth Manigault, daughter of Henry and Charlotte (Hayward) Manigault. She and her son Lewis were killed in a hurricane on Sullivan's Island, S. C., September 22, 1822.

Issue:

1. Gabriella Manigault Morris, b. June 6, 1808, d. September 7, 1871. M., January 11, 1827, John Butler of Philadelphia. One child,

Elizabeth Manigault Butler, b. April 13, 1830, d. June 29, 1862; m., May 2, 1848, Lieutenant-Colonel Julian McAllister, U. S. A. (who was the brother of the late Ward McAllister, and who d. January 3, 1887); surviving issue of this last marriage: Julia G. McAllister, Gabriella M. McAllister (m. Stanley W. Dexter), and Meta E. McAllister (m. John H. Janeway).

2. Margaret Ann Morris, b. May 11, 1810, d. August 26, 1881. M. John B. Grimball; ten children.

3. Lewis Morris, b. July 7, 1812, killed on Sullivan's Island, September 22, 1822.

4. Ralph Izard Morris, b. May 8, 1814, d. April 20, 1860.

5. Harry Manigault Morris, b. November 24, 1817, d. January 20, 1892. M. Georgia Edwards, who d. February 14, 1894. One child, who d. young.

6. Richard Lewis Morris, b. October 8, 1818. M., 1st, April 24, 1845, Sarah Brailsford (no issue); 2d, Anne Elizabeth Dunwoodie (three children).

7. Charles Manigault Morris, b. at Adam's Run, S. C., May 7, 1820, d. March 22, 1895. He entered the United States navy in 1837; resigned in 1861 and entered the confederate navy, in which he served throughout the war, commanding the ship "Florida." M., 1st, Hannah Troup (no issue); 2d, November, 1861, Clementina McAllister, daughter of George Washington McAllister of "Strathy Hall," Bryan County, Ga. Issue:

i. Elizabeth Manigault Morris, b. in Savannah, Ga., February 19, 1863.

ii. Harry Hayward Morris, b. in Caen, Normandy, December 6, 1865, d. in Baltimore, Md., October 28, 1884.

iii. Lewis Morris, M. D., b. in Caen, Normandy, January 26, 1867. He is of the eldest male line from Captain Richard Morris, and, in this line, is the sixth Lewis; surgeon in the United States navy; resides in New York City. M., May 12, 1906, Mary Gibbs Murphy, daughter of Thomas and Mary (Gibbs) Murphy of New York City.

iv. Clementina Rosalie Morris, b. in Brighton, England, January 31, 1873.

8. Charlotte Manigault Morris, b. February 5, 1821, d. at Brighton, England, January, 1902. M. Henry Hayward Manigault, a cousin (no issue).

Colonel Lewis Morris married, 2d, 1837, Amarinth Lowndes. Additional issue, three children, of whom is

Lewis Morris, b. April 8, 1842; lives in Paris, France. By his first wife, Caroline, he had one child, Emily Rosalind Morris, b. December 3, 1870, d. April 21, 1876; his second wife was Minnie Morse.

LEWIS LEE MORRIS, eldest son of General Jacob and Mary Cox Morris, was born in Philadelphia in 1778. In his boyhood he removed with his parents to the present county of Otsego, N. Y., where his father had received a very large grant of land from congress.

Married, 1st, Elizabeth Gilbert, 2d, Catharine Winter.

Issue:

1. Lewis Morris, lived in Binghamton, N. Y.
2. William A. Morris, lived in New York City.
3. John Morris, lived in Friendville, Pa. M., Jane Morris.
4. Charles Lee Morris, removed to Australia.

5. Elizabeth Morris. M. John A. Collier; lived in Rochester, N. Y.
6. Sarah Morris. M. John A. Davis; lived in New York City.
7. James Rutherford Morris. M. Ellen Elizabeth Howe. Issue:
 - i. Laura Merrill Morris. M. Rev. Mr. Hartman.
 - ii. Anna Lee Morris. M. Mr. Pomeroy.
 - iii. Lewis Rutherford Morris. He is a physician, residing in New York City; member of the Calumet, Metropolitan, New York Athletic, South Side, Century, National Arts, and New York Yacht Clubs, the Sons of the Revolution, the Society of Colonial Wars, and the Automobile Club of America. M. Katherine L. S. Clark, daughter of Hon. William A. Clark, United States senator from Montana. One daughter.
 - iv. Catharine Elizabeth Morris.
8. Mary Morris. M. Peter Morris.

GENERAL WILLIAM WALTON MORRIS, son of Lieutenant William Walton and Sarah (Carpender) Morris, was born August 31, 1801. He was graduated from West Point in 1819, and from that time until his death was an officer of the regular army of the United States, being both for duration and distinction of service the most noted member of his family connected with the military profession.

He served against the Aricaree Indians in 1823, was a major of Mounted Creek Volunteers in the Seminole War, 1836-7, gaining two brevets for gallant conduct, and for nine years afterward performed garrison duty, attaining a brilliant reputation as a military lawyer. In the Mexican War he was attached to the judge advocate's department of General Taylor's army on the Rio Grande (1846), was actively engaged in the battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma, and was military governor of Puebla (1847-8). From 1853 to 1861 he was commandant at Fort Kearny, Neb., and at Fort McHenry, Baltimore, Md. In the latter position he promptly brought his guns to bear on the rioters in the memorable affray of April 19, 1861. For this act a writ of habeas corpus was served on him by a Maryland judge, but he refused to answer it on the ground that it had

become inoperative by the breaking out of hostilities. Throughout the Civil War he remained in command of the defenses of Baltimore, rising by the regular grades to brevet major-general. Like his grandfather, Lewis Morris the Signer, he had three sons in the army at the same time as himself.

Died at Fort McHenry, Baltimore, December 11, 1865.

Married, January, 1833, Mary Alexander Ritchie, daughter of Hugh Williamson and Esther (Alexander) Ritchie and granddaughter of Major Archibald Alexander of Delaware, a prisoner on the prison ship "Jersey" during the War of the Revolution.

Issue:

1. William Gouverneur Morris, b. December 24, 1833, d. January 31, 1883; was graduated from the Harvard Law School in 1853, volunteered at the breaking out of the war, and served to its close, rising to the rank of major. M. Helen Louise Carnes; one son, Gouverneur Morris, who d. young.

2. Mary Alexander Morris, d. young.

3. Estelle Morris. M. John Murray Carnochan, M. D., the distinguished physician and scientist. Issue:

i. Harriet Frances Putnam Carnochan. M. Thomas W. Ludlow of Yonkers and had issue.

ii. Mary Morris Carnochan. M. J. Lawrence Aspinwall of New York.

iii. William Walton Morris Carnochan, d. young.

iv. Estelle Morris Carnochan, d. unmarried.

v. Lilian Murray Carnochan. M. Livingston Crosby of New York, great-great-grandson of Philip Livingston and William Floyd, two of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. Issue: 1. Estelle Morris Crosby.

vi. Gouverneur Morris Carnochan; graduated from Harvard in 1886; became a member of the New York Stock Exchange; has been connected many years with the national guard of the state of New York, with the rank of major, and is a member of the state legislature at Albany. M. Matilda Grosvenor Goodridge, who d. January 4, 1905. Issue: 1. John Murray Carnochan, d. young. 2. Frederic Grosvenor Carnochan. 3. Gouverneur Morris Carnochan.

4. Gouverneur Morris, b. 1841, d. December 25, 1865. While at college, aged nineteen, he volunteered in the New York regiment of Colonel Peter A. Porter; was actively engaged on the Peninsula; later entered the regular service as lieutenant in the

marine corps, and continued until the end of the war, dying December 25, 1865.

5. Arthur Morris, b. 1843, d. September 26, 1892. In the winter of 1862 he left college and became second lieutenant in the Fourth Artillery, U. S. A.; was with the second army corps of the army of the Potomac throughout the Peninsula campaign, being engaged in the principal battles; volunteered for special service at Charlestown, Va., and received the commendation of General Hancock on the battlefield; "for gallant and meritorious service" at the engagement of White Oak Swamp received the brevet of first lieutenant, and at Antietam (where his captain and half the men of his battery were killed) was brevetted captain, when only nineteen years of age; at the close of the war was recommended by General Hancock for a majority, which was confirmed by congress, though the commission was not issued. Subsequently he served in the Indian campaigns in the far west, finally receiving a brevet majority. He was a member of the Society of the Cincinnati. M. Adelaide Bettner. Three children, two of whom d. in infancy; the other, Arthur Gouverneur Morris, m. Lilian Brooks.

6. Anne Morris. M. Colonel Joseph Gales Ramsey, U. S. A.
Issue:

i. William Gouverneur Ramsey, civil engineer; served in the Spanish War, becoming major. M. Caroline Canby; five children.

ii. George Douglas Ramsey, M. D.

iii. Joseph Gales Ramsey, d. young.

RICHARD LEWIS MORRIS, son of James and Helen (Van Cortlandt) Morris, was born November 4, 1805. He was graduated from Hamilton College, and in 1826 from the College of Physicians and Surgeons (New York). From 1841 to 1852 he served as health commissioner of New York City, and from 1852 to 1854 as health officer of the port of New York. He was a prominent and successful medical practitioner of his times.

Died at Pelham, N. Y., June 14, 1880.

Married Elizabeth S. Fish, daughter of Colonel Nicholas Fish and sister of Governor Hamilton Fish.

Issue:

1. James Morris, b. October 2, 1832. He received his preparatory education in a select school in New York, entered Harvard University, and was graduated there in 1852, also being graduated as bachelor of laws from the Harvard Law School in 1854. He

is a lawyer in New York City, where he resides; a member of the Association of the Bar, St. Nicholas Society, and Delta Phi. M. Elizabeth W. Gray; one child, Marion Gray Morris, who d. young.

2. Elizabeth S. Morris. M. William St. John Elliot Marshall of Natchez, Miss. Issue:

i. William St. John Elliot Marshall. M. Constance B. Runcie, daughter of Rev. Dr. Runcie. Issue: 1. Jean Dale Marshall. 2. William St. John Elliot Marshall.

ii. Elizabeth Morris Marshall.

iii. Sarah Elliot Marshall. M. Francis L. Mordaunt. Issue: 1. Elizabeth Morris Mordaunt. 2. Mildred C. Mordaunt.

3. Nicholas Fish Morris; lost at sea in the United States sloop of war "Albany."

4. Richard L. Morris, d. young.

5. Richard L. Morris. M. Lillian Monson. Issue:

i. Monson Morris.

ii. Helen Van Cortlandt Morris. M. Nelson Burr.

6. Stuyvesant Fish Morris; graduated from Columbia College in 1863; physician in New York; member of the Century Club and St. Nicholas Society. M. Ellen J. Van Buren, daughter of Smith Van Buren and granddaughter of President Martin Van Buren. Issue:

i. Elizabeth M. Morris.

ii. Van Buren Morris, d. young.

iii. Ellen Van Buren Morris. M. F. Livingston Pell.

iv. Stuyvesant Morris, d. young.

v. Richard L. Morris.

vi. Stuyvesant Fish Morris. M. Elizabeth H. Wynkoop.

Issue: 1. Stuyvesant Fish Morris. 2. Martin Van Buren Morris.

7. Helen Van Cortlandt Morris. M. David King.

8. Charlotte Louisa Morris. M. Martin Gilbert Wilkins, of Morristown, N. J.

9. Margaret L. Morris. M. Bayard U. Livingston of Albany, N. Y. Issue:

i. Louisa Morris Livingston.

ii. Bayard Urquhart Livingston.

WILLIAM HENRY MORRIS, son of James and Helen (Van Cortlandt) Morris, was born August 3, 1810. He lived on the paternal estate at Morrisania, the mansion having been built by his father in 1816, and was a citizen of high reputation, public spirit, and usefulness.

Died February 12, 1896.

Married, 1st, 1834, Hannah C. Newbold. She died in 1842.

Issue:

1. James Staats Morris, b. 1836, d. 1875.
2. Augustus Newbold Morris, b. at Morrisania, June 3, 1838. He was graduated at Columbia College in 1860 and the Columbia Law School in 1863, but did not practice his profession; resides in New York City; prominently identified with charitable and social organizations; for nearly forty years trustee of the Home of Incurables at Fordham; has been governor of the Union Club and president of the Suburban Riding and Driving Club, and is director of the National Horse Show Association and the Coney Island Jockey Club; vice-president of the Plaza Bank. M., December 10, 1862, Eleanor Colford Jones, daughter of General James I. and Elizabeth (Schermerhorn) Jones; she d. April, 1906. Issue:
 - i. Newbold Morris, b. January 12, 1868. He was graduated from the Columbia University Law School in 1891, also attending for two years the Columbia University School of Political Science; is a member of the New York bar. Upon the breaking out of the war with Spain he raised Company M., Twelfth Infantry, New York Volunteers, and served as captain through that war, also having previously been major and inspector of the national guard. He is active in politics as a republican; secretary of the board of trustees of the Teachers' College of Columbia University; manager for several years of the House of Refuge; director of the New York Eye and Ear Hospital; manager of the Kindergarten Association; member of a number of prominent clubs and societies. M., April 9, 1896, Helen S. Kingsland, daughter of George L. and Helen S. (Welles) Kingsland. Issue: 1. Augustus Newbold Morris, b. February 2, 1902. 2. George Lovett Kingsland Morris, b. November 14, 1905.
 - ii. Eva Van Cortlandt Morris.
3. William H. Morris, d. 1882.

William Henry Morris married, 2d, 1846, Caroline Halsted, daughter of Caleb Halsted; no issue. Married, 3d, 1850, Ella Birkhead, daughter of Hugh Birkhead of Baltimore; she died November 21, 1881.

Issue:

4. Augusta McEvers Morris. M., October 10, 1871, Frederic J. de Peyster of New York City. Issue:
 - i. Helen Van Cortlandt de Peyster.
 - ii. Frederic Ashton de Peyster, b. October 29, 1874.
 - iii. Frances Goodhue de Peyster.

iv. Augusta Morris de Peyster.

v. Ella Morris de Peyster, M., December 14, 1905, William Brock Shoemaker; he d. June 21, 1906.

5. Juliet B. Morris. M. Philip Livingston of New York City.

HENRY MORRIS, third son of Comomdore Richard Valentine and Anne (Walton) Morris, and grandson of Lewis Morris the Signer, was born at Morrisania, August 17, 1806. He was educated in the city of New York, graduated at Columbia College in 1825, and began the practice of law in the western part of New York State, later removing to New York City, where he died, January 10, 1854.

Married, October 11, 1831, Mary Natalie Spencer, daughter of Hon. John Canfield and Eliza S. (Scott) Spencer of Albany, N. Y. She died April 24, 1886.

[Her father, Hon. John Canfield Spencer, was a son of the noted jurist, Hon. Ambrose Spencer, and a descendant in the sixth generation of William Spencer, b. in England, who settled in Cambridge, Mass., in 1631; d. in Albany, May 18, 1855; occupied many prominent offices in New York State; was one of the famous revisers of the statutes (1827); served in congress, and was secretary of war and of the treasury (1841-4).]

Issue:

1. Mary Natalie Morris, d., unmarried, November 8, 1870.

2. Henry Lewis Morris, b. in New York City, August 8, 1845. He was graduated from the Columbia Law School in 1868, and since 1869 has been practicing law in New York City, devoting his attention principally to matters connected with trusts and the settlement of estates; is prominent in religious, charitable, and benevolent work; was one of the founders in 1877 of the trustees of the estate and property of the diocesan convention of the Episcopal Church in New York City, has since served continuously as its secretary, and has been very largely instrumental in the development of that important corporation; active in the affairs of the Home for Old Men and Aged Couples, the Seamen's Society of the Episcopal Church, and the Cathedral of St. John the Divine; vestryman and warden of St. Bartholomew's Church for nearly thirty years, member of the convention of the Episcopal Church in the diocese of New York for twenty-five years, and representative of that diocese in the last two triennial general conventions; identified at various times with political movements in the public interest; patron of the American Geograph-

ical Society, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and the American Museum of Natural History, and member of several leading social organizations. For a number of years he resided in Morrisania, where his children were born upon property which has been in the family name for over two hundred years. M., November 5, 1868, Anna Rutherford Russell, daughter of Archibald and Helen Rutherford (Watts) Russell. [Her paternal grandfather was John Russell, president of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Scotland. Archibald Russell, father of Mrs. Morris (b. in Edinburgh, 1811, d. in New York City, April 17, 1871), was prominent in philanthropic work in New York, being the principal founder of the Five Points House of Industry, and a member of the Christian Commission and chairman of the Famine Relief Commission during the Civil War. The mother of Mrs. Morris (whose maiden name was Helen Rutherford Watts) was a daughter of Dr. John and Anna (Rutherford) Watts (cousins), granddaughter of Robert Watts and Hon. John Rutherford, and a descendant of the Alexander, Livingston, and other notable New York families.] Issue:

- i. Eleanor Russell Morris. M., January 22, 1903, Robert H. McCormick, Jr., of Chicago, only son of R. Hall and Sarah Lord (Day) McCormick.
- ii. Lewis Spencer Morris, b. August 21, 1884, at Morrisania.
3. John C. Morris, d. young.

Line of Chief-Justice Richard Morris (IV.)

LEWIS GOUVERNEUR MORRIS, youngest son of Robert and Frances (Ludlum) Morris, and grandson of Chief-Justice Richard Morris, was born at Claverack, Columbia County, N. Y., during a temporary residence of his parents there, August 19, 1808. He was privately educated, and lived at home with his parents, inheriting the "Mt. Fordham" estate. An enthusiastic agriculturist, he devoted his attention particularly to improving the breeds of American cattle, imported many valuable animals, and probably did as much toward increasing the value of the live stock of the country as any other man of his times.

At the time of the construction of the Croton Aqueduct, Mr. Morris took the leadership in the successful movement of the citizens of the lower part of Westchester County

against the proposal of the commissioners to carry the aqueduct across the Harlem River on a low bridge, which would have permanently destroyed the navigation of that stream. The river was already obstructed by Macomb's Dam, built many years previously by private enterprise; and, as the most practical proceeding, it was decided by Morris and his associates to force an opening through the dam, and thus bring about legal adjudication of the whole question of artificial impediments to the Harlem River navigation. On the night of September 14, 1838, a breach was accordingly made in the dam, and a small vessel, the "Nonpareil," especially chartered for the occasion, was sailed through by the adventurous citizens. In the resulting lawsuit the action of the citizens was fully sustained, the court declaring that any obstruction of the Harlem River, as an arm of the sea and navigable stream, was a public nuisance. The project of a low aqueduct bridge was thereupon abandoned, the "High Bridge" was built, and the principle contended for was permanently established.

Mr. Morris was appointed, in 1840, inspector of the Fourth Division of New York State militia, with the rank of colonel. At the breaking out of the war in 1861, he was active and prominent in support of the national government, serving as a member of the war committee. He received the appointment of colonel of volunteers in August, 1862, and was instrumental in recruiting the One Hundred and Thirty-Fifth Regiment (later the Sixth New York Heavy Artillery), which was commanded by Brigadier-General William H. Morris (son of the poet, George P. Morris, but not a member of the Morrisania family). He was president of the New York State Agricultural Society, and a member of the Royal Agricultural Society of England.

Died at his residence, "Mt. Fordham," Morris Heights, New York City, September 19, 1900, in his ninety-third year.

Married Emily Lorillard, daughter of Jacob and Margaretta (Kuntze) Lorillard. She died in 1850.

Issue:

1. Fordham Morris, b. at "Mt. Fordham," July 23, 1842. He was graduated from Trinity College in 1864 and from Columbia Law School in 1868. Upon the organization, through the efforts of his father, of the One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Regiment, he entered that body; was assistant-adjutant and aide-de-camp to his kinsman, General William Walton Morris, then commanding the separate defenses of Baltimore; served for a short time with his regiment in the army of the Potomac; was then transferred to the staff of the chief of artillery of the Fifth Army Corps, in which he was assistant-adjutant-general of artillery from the Wilderness to the surrender at Appomattox, participating in all the battles of that famous concluding period of the war. After his admission to the bar he became a practicing lawyer in New York; took a prominent part in a professional way in the movement toward improving the navigation of the Harlem River, and upon the completion of that work delivered the formal address before the North Side Board of Trade; chairman of the committee of one hundred that advocated laying out the Concourse, delivering the address before the board of estimate and apportionment which resulted in adopting that public improvement; member of the Loyal Legion, Lafayette Post, G. A. R., the New York Historical Society, the American Geographical Society, the Museum of Natural History, the Zoological Society, the St. Nicholas Society, and the Century Club; author of various essays and papers, especially on phases of the local history of Westchester County. M., December 19, 1872, Annie Louise Westcot, daughter of Joseph H., and Sarah Adeë (Timpson) Westcot. Issue:

i. Emily Lorillard Morris. M., April 28, 1896, R. Horace Gallatin, son of Frederic and Almy Goelet (Gerry) Gallatin.

2. Francis Morris, b. July 13, 1844, d. February 12, 1883. He was graduated from the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis; was in the naval service of the United States during the Civil War, rising to the rank of commander; was present in the attack on Fort Fisher and was subsequently executive officer of the "Tennessee." M. Harriet H. Bedlow, daughter of Henry and Josephine (Homer) Bedlow. Issue:

i. Alice P. Morris (m. Frank S. B. Cheesman; one child, Stuart Morris Cheesman).

ii. Lewis Gouverneur Morris.
Two other sons, d. young.

Line of Gouverneur Morris (IV.)

GOUVERNEUR MORRIS, 3d, son of Gouverneur and Patsey Jefferson (Cary) Morris, was born at Old Morrisania, December 27, 1844. He was a journalist in New York City; an accomplished writer on yachting, dramatic, and literary subjects.

Died February 16, 1897.

Married, June 30, 1873, Henrietta Baldwin.

Issue:

1. Gouverneur Morris, 4th, b. in New York City, February 7, 1876. He was graduated from Yale in 1898. Mr. Morris is one of the well-known American authors of our day, especially as a contributor of short stories to magazines. He resides in New York City. M., 1906, Elsie Waterbury, daughter of James Ward and Kate A. (Furman) Waterbury. One daughter.

2. Henrietta Fairfax Morris. M. Stephen Bonsall.

THE LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION.

BY HORACE S. LYMAN.

(Continued from p. 366.)

THEIR progress down the lower river, however, although past the mountains and the rough water, was attended with other discomforts, of which the journals complain even more. These were high winds and rain, and at least one heavy shower of hail accompanied by lightning and heavy thunder. Well known points, such as Castle Rock and Rooster Rock, and the mouth of the Sandy River, or Quicksand, as they called it, are described. This latter is just opposite the point reached by Broughton, more than ten years before these Americans, and named for Vancouver. Here the valley, more than sixty miles wide, was reached, and was described as that of the Columbia, being considered as drained by the Sandy—the Willamette not being seen until the return trip, and named the Multnomah. Many Indians were seen, but they were less friendly than above; or at least had had enough intercourse with whites to be less unsophisticated, and to place a greater value upon the articles carried by the explorers. Once the Wahkiums attempted robbery.

On the 7th they were “at last presented with the glorious sight of the ocean—that ocean, the object of all our labors, and the reward of all our anxieties”—though properly speaking it was not the ocean, but the shining waters of the lower estuary, and the open gate leading to the ocean. But there were many difficulties and hard winds before reaching the sea. At one point for six days they were storm bound

and dared not venture on the boisterous river, though they saw the natives passing and repassing with impunity. One particularly disagreeable or even dangerous night is mentioned, which was passed encamped upon driftlogs under a clayey cliff. The tide rose, setting the logs afloat, and the erosion of the waves, mingled with the violent rain, loosened the earth and stones of the cliff, so that these came tumbling down. Indeed, the north shore from Cathlamet down, which they had inconsiderately taken, or had followed with the idea of reaching Cape Hancock, was too wild for men traveling in crafts of the size they had. However, Chinook Point was at last rounded, Cape Hancock was visited, and the Pacific was seen amid its waves and storms through the misty atmosphere. The weather beach was also visited from the land side. But after careful examination it was believed that a better location for passing the winter might be found on the south side. Being unacquainted with the manner of the storms in the winter season they were met by unexpected winds, and it was not until the 26th that the river was crossed. This was done above Tongue Point, reaching which they were storm-bound for more than a week, and it was not until the 7th of December that a place chosen by Lewis for the winter quarters was reached by the entire party.

This was on a stream called by the Indians Netul—or rather called by the whites by that name from the Indian spot on the shore next its mouth. It is now known as the Lewis and Clark. This, no doubt, proved much more comfortable than any place on the north side, being more sheltered, and also affording good hunting for elk during the winter.

Upon the level of a hill of about thirty feet elevation above the high tide was constructed a comfortable building, inclosed with stockade, and the winter was passed with little sickness or other serious misfortune. This was found to be a point well selected for the purposes of a winter en-

campment. Up the river, in the deep bottoms where the huckleberry bushes and brakes furnished abundant forage, were many herds of elk, and the slaughter of as many as eleven is recorded for one day; though more than once such wholesale butchery proved an improvidence, the meat spoiling in the woods. It was also no great distance across the peninsula to the ocean beach, where were the extensive Clatsop Plains, which were also visited by the elk and by the deer. Geese and ducks frequented the many ponds of these sandy plains in great numbers; and in the streams falling into the ocean on that shore were many kinds of fish which were abundant in the winter. Besides this, somewhat to the southward, and across a stream now called the Necanicum, entering the ocean at the summer resort well known as Seaside, a suitable location was found for evaporating sea water to procure salt, of which their supply was exhausted. The most positive evidence left, in a monumental way, of the visit of the explorers, is of the old salt cairn near the stony beach.

The winter months were worn slowly away in the routine of camp life and in visits to the Clatsop Plains and the ocean beach, and in making an expedition during a brief interval of sunny weather over Tillamook Head, a high bold promontory that juts upon deep water, entirely closing passage by the beach, onto the ocean shore beyond where a whale was stranded, and to which all the Indians were flocking to get some of the blubber and oil. On January 5, 1806, a party headed by Clark set out to see the whale and get blubber, and had hardly started before Chaboneau and Sacajawea asked permission to go also. Sacajawea made a very effective plea. The journal says: "The poor woman stated very earnestly that she had traveled a long way with us to behold the great water, yet she had never been down to the coast; and now that this monstrous fish was also to be seen, it seemed hard that she should not be permitted to see the ocean or the whale. So reasonable a re-

quest could not be denied; they were therefore suffered to go with Captain Clark." From the top of Tillamook Head a view was obtained, in the clear January air of a sunny day, that moved even the enthusiasm of adventurers already sated with natural wonders. The journal says: "Here one of the most delightful views in nature presented itself. Immediately in front was the ocean, breaking in fury the coast, from the rocks of Cape Disappointment as far as the eye could discern to the northwest, and against the highlands and irregular piles of rock which diversify the shore to the southeast (south). To this boisterous scene the Columbia with its tributary waters, widening into bays as it approached the ocean, and studded on both sides with the Chinook and Clatsop villages, formed a charming contrast; while immediately beneath our feet were stretched rich prairies, enlivened by three beautiful streams, which conducted the eye to small lakes at the foot of the hills. We stopped to enjoy the romantic prospect from this place, which we distinguished by the name of Clark's Point of View."

The Indians were found friendly, and although very close bargainers, and having ideas of value derived from the traders who visited the Columbia, were often quite liberal in their gifts, and hospitable whenever visited. Kobaiway, or Comowool, as incorrectly rendered in the journal, the head chief of the Clatsops, proved a reliable friend; and the following description of Clark's visit to a village of three houses on the beach is quite pleasing: "Captain Clark was received with much hospitality. As soon as he entered clean mats were spread, and roots were placed before him on small neat platters made of rushes. After he had eaten the men of the other houses came and smoked with him. They all appeared much cleaner in their persons and diet than Indians generally are, and frequently washed their hands and faces, a ceremony by no means frequent elsewhere. . . . Towards evening it began to rain and blow

very violently from the southwest, and Captain Clark therefore determined to remain over night. When they thought sufficient time had elapsed for his appetite to return, an old woman presented him, in a bowl made of a light colored horn, with a kind of sirup made from a species of berry common in the country, about the size of a cherry, and called by the Indians shelwell;¹ of these berries a bread was also prepared, which being boiled with roots, formed a kind of soup, which was served in neat wooden trenchers; and these, with some cockles, constituted his repast."

The Clatsop and Chinook Indians were more amply provided with food than any others met with, having many kinds of berries besides the sallal as mentioned above, and using native roots and tubers, such as bulbs of two or three kinds of lilies; the root of the lupine, which much resembles a sweet potato; that of the seaside anemone, a tuber attaining the girth of a man's arm, or even of the thigh, and several feet long, and almost as appetizing as the yam; the root of the thistle, which is more like a turnip; and also the dried roots brought from above, which were an article of commerce; the wappato, camas, and shanatawhe. These, together with the abundant elk, deer, raccoons, and rabbits, and innumerable shoals of fish, provided sustenance for a population much greater than that of the natives. To procure and properly cook these foods, however, involved much more labor, with the inadequate native implements, than among whites by cultivation. No evidence of want such as seen among the Shoshones, or of the exacting toils of the Nez Perces, was observed among the Clatsops. The explorers had no lack, either; though they could not depend upon a supply of just what they wanted from the Indians, who often asked great prices for food. Kobaiway, however, is mentioned a number of times as appearing with a timely supply, which he sold reasonably; and the Cathla-

¹More correctly *sallal*.

mets occasionally brought camas in quantity. The elk were abundant, and if any want was felt by the Americans it was usually due to their own improvidence, in either letting the animals spoil in their hides, as they do even if left a few hours, or, with the stubbornness often seen in persons coming into new situations, insisting upon following the usage learned elsewhere. Thus having spent one winter in the intensely dry and cold country of the Missouri, they now often left their meat exposed in the warm air of the Pacific, and then suffered because it was spoiled in a few days. The best hunter was Drewyer, the Canadian half-breed, who killed seven elk on one jaunt.

The Clatsop Indians proved entirely friendly, and much less obtrusive than those of the upper river tribes. Once at least the life of a white man was saved from intended murder and robbery by a Tillamook, by a woman giving warning. It was always maintained, also, by Kobaiway that he prevented an attack on the fort by the Klaskanies, a tribe ranging back to the Nehalem; and this is not improbable, as the outside Indians almost invariably followed the policy of beginning a disturbance in the territory of a tribe friendly to the whites, in order to bring upon such a tribe the punishment. Although Kuskaleh and several other Clatsops are mentioned favorably by Lewis and Clark, Kobaiway seems to have been the favorite, or at least deemed the most considerable and reliable. To him was given the fort after further use was not required, and he was intrusted with a document to be given to some shipmaster, giving a short sketch of the journey to the Pacific. The following favorable reference to this chief is found: "On the 24th (March) Comowool, who was by far the most friendly and decent savage we had seen in this neighborhood, came with a large party of Clatsops, bringing, among other articles, sturgeon, and a small fish which had just begun to make its appearance in the Columbia."

Nevertheless, although so friendly that the principal

concern of the captains became to prevent too great familiarity with them on the part of their men, lest lack of caution should tempt the Clatsops to treachery, these Indians were hardly favorites of the Americans. Unjustly disparaging remarks are often made of them. The men are described as rather short, ugly, and ill-made, with squat bodies and crooked legs. This would apply to only a portion—the slaves,—as the legs of the Clatsops themselves were remarkably straight; nor were they deficient in height, being long-bodied. A part of this estimation must probably be referred to a certain prejudice among white men generally. Thus even to the present time we find “the ideal Indian” admired. He is the tall, lean, catlike species, never stooping to work, moody, and treacherous, dying rather than yielding to white men’s ways, and interesting chiefly because he is picturesque. The blanketed Indian dandy often seen loitering around the reservations excites much more interest generally than the thrifty Indian farmer, dressed in white garb, or the intellectual Indian student pondering his books. A chief like Joseph, who defied all the armies of the United States and marched two thousand miles in a single season, seems much more “ideal” than the faithful Reuben, who performed a much greater exploit in bringing back across the plains the broken remnant of Joseph’s band. Joseph is known everywhere; Reuben gained only the reward of a good deed performed.

The peaceable and industrious Clatsops did not excite so much notice, or gain even such favorable comment, as the moody Shoshones. However, we find constant references to qualities that are highly estimable. Thus as to their intelligence we see the following: “The Clatsops and other nations at the mouth of the Columbia visited us with great freedom, and we endeavored to cultivate their friendship. . . . We found them inquisitive and loquacious, with understandings by no means deficient in acuteness; and

though fond of feasts, and generally cheerful, never gay. Everything they observe excites their attention and inquiry. . . . To all our questions they answered with great intelligence, and the conversation rarely slackened, as there was a constant discussion of events, trade, politics, and so forth, in the small but active circle of the Killimucks, Clatsops, Cathlamahs, Wahkiacums, and Chinooks."

As to their temperance, it is said: "We did not see any liquor of an intoxicating kind used among these Indians or any Indians west of the Rocky Mountains, the universal beverage being pure water"; though excessive indulgence in tobacco smoke, and the universal gambling habit—the latter of strictly native origin—were noticed. As to business sense, it is said: "In traffic they are acute and intelligent, displaying a dexterity and finesse that would scarcely be expected." These people, too, they found disposed to peace; as the journal says, "The nations near the mouth of the Columbia enjoy great tranquility, none of them being engaged in war." Even slaves taken in war were treated with kindness, being adopted in the Indian families and brought up as their own children. As to their treatment of women, an equally favorable remark is found: "Among the Clatsops and Chinooks the women have a rank and influence rarely found among Indians." The old or superannuated were not left to die, as among the hunting tribes of the plains. The men performed labor, almost equally with the women. "Then men collect wood, attend to the fires, assist in cleaning the fish, and make houses, canoes, and wooden utensils; and wherever strangers are to be entertained, or a great feast prepared, the meats are served up by them." A remark that the Indians at the mouth of the river were better armed than those above, who owed exemption more to their timidity than their forbearance, would not seem to apply to the Clatsops, who inflicted great loss upon the Cascades, and kept the river route open.

The unfavorable features, and such as would make a deep

impression and create dislike, may be traced to the custom of flattening the head, which gives a certain grotesque or brutal appearance to the face, the readiness with which the virtue of the young women was bartered for trinkets, and the marks of disease, especially the loss of an eye. The Clatsops, although a comparatively wealthy people, had but about four years before the arrival of the explorers been visited with a disease, thought to be smallpox, which destroyed more than half the tribe. By this probably a certain demoralization, or loss of spirit, as the Indians grieve hopelessly for the dead, had supervened.

Tradition has remained among the Clatsop Indians of Lewis and Clark. Mr. Silas B. Smith, a grandson of Kobaiway on his mother's side, says :

"Concerning the arrival of the Lewis and Clark expedition at the mouth of the Columbia, and their sojourn at Fort Clatsop, more or less tradition was handed down by the Indians. At that time Kob-ai-way was the principal chief of the Clatsop Indians, within whose territory Fort Clatsop was established. Lewis and Clark erroneously gave the name of the chief Comowool—that arose no doubt from the indistinct manner in which the Indians pronounced the name; according to their pronunciation the *b* in the name is but faintly sounded. On the eve of their homeward journey Lewis and Clark presented their stockade at Fort Clatsop to Kobaiway, and also left him a certificate announcing their arrival at the mouth of the Columbia River, to be given to the captain of the first vessel that should arrive at the river. . . . The Indians here used to tell of the remarkable marksmanship of Captains Lewis and Clark with firearms, and of the surprises they used to give the savages by the wonderful accuracy of their shots. The Indians would notice some waterfowl sitting far beyond the range of bow and arrow, and would ask one or the other of the captains if he could hit it with a rifle ball; a trial would generally bring down the bird, sometimes just chipping off its head. Of course such feats would greatly impress the Indians with the remarkable qualities of the white men. An Indian youth, Twiltch by name, used to assist at Fort Clatsop in the hunting of elk and other game, and was thus taught the use of firearms, in the handling of which he became very proficient. I knew him in his later years, and in my earlier acquaintance with him he stood at the head of the hunters of his tribe. It was his boast that he was taught his art by Lewis and Clark. He seldom went out without securing an elk, and he would tell his people that he had the power to charm the game, and they were not able to get away from him; his usually good fortune induced a good many to believe him.

"The Indians inhabiting the upper part of Young's River Valley and the Nehalem Valley were known as the Klatskanine people. It is claimed by Kobaiway that these Klatskanines were disposed to attack the camp at Fort Clatsop, and it was only through his influence and constant dissuasion that they were restrained and no violence was committed. . . .

"Lewis and Clark state that the Indians near Tillamook Head called the Columbia River 'Shocatilcum'; that upon inquiry of them as to where they got their wappatoes, they gave this name, meaning the Columbia River. But they entirely misunderstood the Indians' meaning. This is very easy of explanation. The wappatoes used by the Clatsops were obtained from Cathlamet Bay, above Tongue Point on the Columbia River. *Shocatilcum* was the chief of the Cathlamets; at that time his tribe was Shocatilcum's people, and when the Clatsops were asked where they got their wappatoes, they pointed over toward the Columbia and said Shocatilcum, meaning only that they had got them from Shocatilcum's people. . . . The Indians in this north-west country as far east as the Rocky Mountains never name a river as a river. They name localities. . . . Some have even told me that they had found the Indian name of the Columbia; but it is a mistake."

No name for any river, the Columbia or any of its tributaries, says Mr. Smith, has been found among Indians; names that the whites understood as such were altogether of places along the streams. The Indians' idea of water was no doubt about like ours of the air—a universal element, just the same in one place as another; the only particularity was the shore or coast that might embrace the water; but the name attached to the place, not to the stream, or water.

The site of Fort Clatsop, at the salt cairn, near Seaside, where salt was obtained by evaporation of sea water by use of five kettles, was visited in August of 1899 by Mr. O. D. Wheeler, of *Western Wonderland*, and Mr. Smith's identification of both places, with some of the Indians, was accepted as entirely satisfactory and conclusive.

It is stated by Gass that one hundred and thirty-one elk and twenty deer were killed by the party between December 1 and March 20. This would represent over two thousand pounds of meat to each man of the party, and as these were considered by the Clatsops the same as their range stock some idea of the liberality of the Indians from their point of view may be obtained. Probably a large amount of the

meat was given to the Indians, and much of it was left to spoil in the woods after the hides were taken for leather and moccasins. Gass also mentions the valuable qualities of the spruce trees for split boards, calling this, however, "white cedar."

Thus the winter was spent, in a most friendly way with the natives, and with a great abundance of all that woods or water could afford. But the season proved very wet, being perhaps unusually so even for this humid coast climate; Gass mentions but six clear days, and twelve on which rain did not fall. Some of the men contracted rheumatism, and influenza became common. It was the intention to remain until the ships arrived in April, but on account of the sickness, and that the game was leaving for the hills, it was concluded to return up the river and hunt in the valley between the coast and the Cascade Mountains. The winter fort was left March 23, and the return journey proved scarcely less interesting than that westward, although it will be impossible to give even a detail to any extent.

The chief event was the discovery of the Willamette River, called by them Multnomah; taking the word from the Indian name *Emulthnomah*, a point on the west side of the river a little above Sauvie's Island. The name *Walamt*, for which the river is now called, was a point on the west side near the falls. On the passage down the Columbia the mouth of the Willamette was hidden by the islands; on the passage up the party was impressed that the great valley, which they had more leisure now to observe, was too large to be drained by only the comparatively little Quicksand, or Sandy; and learning of some Indians that there was another stream, they returned, and made a most interesting examination. It is thus recorded in their narrative, and is an exceedingly valuable fragment from the journal, as it not only gives a delightful description of the first sight by white men of the beautiful river of western Oregon, which has since become the seat of the metropolis of the Pacific

Northwest, but illustrates also the kindly and humorous methods employed by Captain Clark in dealing with the natives, and how by arousing both their curiosity or superstitions, and their sense of duty, he carried any point he chose without recourse to violence. While camping on the north side of the Columbia, just opposite the upper mouth of the Sandy, and hunting, there came, about eight o'clock in the morning, into their camp two young Indians, who said they were of a tribe called Cushooks (Clackamas?), who lived at the falls of a large river that came into the Columbia from the south; "and they drew a map of the country with a coal, on a mat." This was an accomplishment quite generally found among the Indians, that of map-drawing. Captain Clark at once was interested, and by offering one of the young men a burning glass secured him as a guide to accompany him up the river, and with seven of the men set out at once. This was about eleven o'clock in the morning, and taking a course down the south side of the Columbia, he found at three in the afternoon a village of twenty-four rush houses, but only one was occupied. This he entered, and found some of the Neerchokioo tribe. On entering one of the apartments he offered several tempting articles in exchange for wappatoes, of which he wished to obtain a supply. "But," proceeds the journal, "the Indians appeared sullen and ill-humored and refused to give him anything." He then devised the following little harmless scheme. "Sitting down by the fire opposite to the men, he drew a portfire match from his pocket, and threw a small piece of it into the flames; at the same time he took out his pocket compass, and by means of a magnet which happened to be in his inkhorn, made the needle turn around very briskly. The match immediately took fire and burned violently, on which the Indians, terrified at the strange exhibition, brought a quantity of wappato and laid it at his feet, begging him to put out the bad fire; while an old woman continued to speak with great vehemence, as if

praying and imploring protection. After receiving the roots Captain Clark put up the compass, and as the match went out of itself tranquillity was restored, though the women and children still sought refuge in their beds and behind the men." He paid for what he took, and smoked with them, showing the most hearty good will, though the Indians still regarded him with some dread as a great maker of medicine.

Some miles below this village he found the entrance to the Willamette; the island which they had noted as seen from the north side proving to be three smaller islands, between which the broad and deep stream from the southeast broke over into the greater Columbia. It was now late in the afternoon, and the weather was evidently fine and clear, as the five snow-capped mountains were all visible.

"From its entrance Mount Ranier bears nearly north; Mount St. Helens north; with a very high humped mountain a little to the east of it, which seems to lie in the same chain with the conic-pointed mountain before mentioned [Mount Adams]. Mount Hood bore due east [considerably south of east], and Captain Clark now discovered to the southeast a mountain which he had not yet seen, to which he gave the name of Mount Jefferson. Like Mount St. Helens, its figure is a regular one, covered with snow, and it is probably of equal height with that mountain. . . . The current of this river [the Multnomah] is as gentle as that of the Columbia [the lower course]; its surface is smooth and even, and it appears to possess water enough for the largest ship, since, on sounding with a line of five fathoms, he could find no bottom at least one-third of the way across."

Ten miles [less] up from the mouth he reached a large wooden house on the east side, no doubt almost precisely the site of the suburban point St. Johns; and here, twilight falling, he intended to sleep. But finding the old building, which was thirty by forty feet, and built of wide boards, infested with fleas, preferred remaining outside. He noticed with admiration for the honesty of the natives that the absent inhabitants had left their valuables, such as canoes, mats, bladders, train oil, baskets, bowls, and trenchers, lying about the house at the mercy of every visitor;

and added drily: "A proof, indeed, of their respect for the property of each other, though we had very conclusive evidence that the property of white men was not deemed equally sacred."

The next day, April 3, a point somewhat below the site of the city of Portland was reached.² It is described as in

²Captain Clark's exploration of the Willamette extended, according to his estimate, a distance of five miles above the mouth of Willamette Slough—three miles to his camp on the east side of the river and two miles the following morning. This would bring him, as Doctor Coues states, about Waud's Bluff and Swan Island. The distances traveled up stream by the explorers are usually very much overestimated. Doctor Coues says of the journal for March 29: "Distances seem overestimated to day." This distance was nineteen miles. The estimate for the following day was twenty-three miles, extending from the vicinity of Fales' landing to the site of Vancouver. The actual distance does not exceed fifteen miles. From this camp to the next one, opposite the mouth of the Sandy River, a distance of about fifteen miles, the estimate is twenty-five miles. The distance from the mouth of the Willamette River to the mouth of the slough is estimated at seven miles. The actual distance does not exceed three miles, and could not at the time have been appreciably greater. From this habit of overestimating distances traveled up stream, it is safe to assume that the highest point reached was much less than five miles above the mouth of Willamette Slough. The large wooden house, in the neighborhood of which the party slept, and which, if three miles above the slough, as estimated, must have been at about the site of St. Johns, was the temporary residence of Indians living near the falls, who came there to gather wappato. It is not likely that such a residence was at or near the site of St. Johns. It was probably some distance below, in proximity to the Wappato Lakes in that vicinity. Indian villages and camps were usually on the banks of bayous and ponds, convenient for fishing or gathering mussels or wappatoes. Evidences of such villages may still be seen on the low grounds of the Columbia, and it is probable that epidemics of fever and ague, to which the Indians were subject, were aggravated, if not caused, by these malarial residences.

The highest point reached by Captain Clark was where "he came to the center of a bend under the high land on the right side from which its (the river's) course, as could be discerned, was to the E. S. E." This point was probably a short distance above Linnton, near the site of the old Springville wharf—much in evidence thirty years ago—a little below St. Johns, on the opposite side of the river. Below this point the river curves crescent-shaped to its mouth. Above, to the west of Swan Island, which appears to be a continuation of the east main shore line, the river is "discerned" in a southeast course, practically straight to the railroad bridge in the lower part of the city of Portland, a distance of about seven miles. This course conforms closely to the last view of the Willamette River recorded in the journal, and there is no other that approximates it. At this point, and at no other, at least within a distance that Captain Clark could have reached in time to have returned to the house of the Neerchokioo at about eleven o'clock, the river curves in close to the high lands on the right side. The fact standing alone that Swan Island and Mock's bottom, the latter covered with water at that stage of the river, and constituting a notable feature in the landscape, are not mentioned in that faithful journal, which recorded islands and sand bars and "willow points," shows that these were not discovered, as they certainly would have been if the reconnoissance had extended far enough to have permitted it.—JUDGE C. B. BELLINGEN.

its first loneliness, but still impressive beauty. "Early the next morning Captain Clark proceeded up the river, which during the night had fallen about five inches [owing to the tide]. At the distance of two miles he came to the center of a bend under the highlands on the right side, from which its course, as far as could be discerned, was to the east of southeast [south of southeast]. At this place the Multnomah is five hundred yards wide, and for half that distance across a cord of five fathoms would not reach the bottom. It appears to be washing away its banks, and has more sand bars and willow points than the Columbia. Its regular, gentle current, the depth, smoothness, and uniformity with which it rolls its vast body of water, prove that its supplies are at once distant and steady; nor, judging from its appearance and course, is it rash to believe that the Multnomah and its tributary streams water the vast extent of country between the western mountains and those of the sea coast, as far, perhaps, as the Gulf of California."

This was, to be sure, a great overestimate; yet the Willamette in the spring time compares favorably in volume and looks with streams like the Colorado or Missouri. Its volume, however, is nearer one-twentieth that of the Columbia than one-fourth. From this point the captain returned, and by eleven o'clock again reached the house of the Neerchokioos, where he had performed his tricks with slow fuses and his magnetic needle, and remarks naively that "they were all so much alarmed at his presence, notwithstanding his visit yesterday, that he remained a very few minutes only."

The return trip of the Lewis and Clark expedition through the valley of the Columbia and over the Bitter Root Mountains was greatly aided by the Nez Perces, who proved the most faithful and abiding of friends, and from that first friendship never, as a tribe, have been swerved. In the Blackfoot country the only serious trouble with any Indians ever occurred. Here Lewis and his three men—

having separated from the main party—were robbed by the Blackfeet, and in order to recover their animals attacked and killed two of the eight thieves. They then made their flight, marching or rather running one hundred and twenty miles in twenty-four hours, meeting at length the main party. From this first encounter with whites is said to date the implacable hostility of the Blackfeet, which lasted over half a century. Other instances are on record, where the hostility of Indians was excited by a false step, that made the whole bias of the tribe that of enemies, and cost the whites many lives and the tribe's final extinction. The implacable hate of the southern Oregon Indians is said to have dated from the killing of one of their tribe by the first party of whites coming from California.

On the other hand, the uniform policy of Lewis and Clark, maintained at all times except in this one instance, of conciliation and friendship, left such a broad mark as to make the leading and central Indian tribes the friends of the Americans. The Indian history, and the history of Oregon, would have been far different, if the Nez Percés, Mandans, Sioux, Shoshones, Walla Wallas, Wascos, Chinooks, Tillamooks, and Clatsops had gained the disposition from the first of the Blackfeet and the Rogue Rivers. The white man's superiority, both in knowledge and arts, and weapons, was made apparent to these great central tribes; but as no effort to use that superiority in a manner disadvantageous or hurtful to the Indians was shown, it gave no menace, but rather the assurance of great advantage. The expedition was planned by Jefferson in the light of the American idea, which had been successfully established by the Revolution—not, certainly, that the wandering savages of North America were the equals of the civilized and instructed whites, nor that they were to be fictitiously regarded so, but that, as among the whites themselves, the relations between the two races were to be established along the points of natural equality, that is, the rights of the red

men to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, including the opportunity of industry and to learn the superior arts, were to be made the points of intercourse. With the utmost fidelity, and with all but perfect success, the two American captains carried through the detail of his plan, leaving lasting respect and friendship among the red men all the way from the mouth of the Missouri to the mouth of the Columbia. The Mandans, Aricaras, Flatheads, Nez Perces, and Chinooks, with the Clatsops and Tillamooks, always cherished and preserved that friendship; the Sioux, Snakes, and Walla Wallas, with the Palouses and Klikitats, were friends until pressed severely by white settlements or unless embroiled in the conflicts of white contestants. Jefferson's assumption that even savages would be able to understand, and willing to respond to a just and liberal treatment, along the line of the newly promulgated doctrines of human rights, was thus abundantly justified.

Lewis did not live to reach Washington. After arriving at St. Louis he was occupied closely in government service, being made governor of Louisiana. After a few years he was obliged to visit the national capital, and in company with a single servant proceeded by the southern route. At a lonely country tavern he was found, as reported by the keepers of the place, dead in his room. The woman in charge said that he was heard during the night stirring about, and although alone, either reading or talking aloud, and "arguing like a lawyer." Until quite recently the supposition has been that in a moment of melancholy, induced perhaps by some trouble in his accounts with the government, he committed suicide. The other theory, that he was killed by his guide or perhaps by the tavern keeper, for his money, is gaining credit. Clark was made a brigadier-general of the Louisiana militia and Indian agent for the territory, and in 1813 governor of Missouri. He died in 1838 at the age of sixty-nine.

As a final estimate of this expedition, and its results, it

may be said that it represented the action of the American people in their social and organic capacity. It had no incentive of individual gain, but was enthusiastically supported by the people without exception, as a way of satisfying public curiosity and making a line that individuals might follow. It was one of those theoretical projects, based upon general interest and ideal conclusions, by which organized society has often anticipated individual wants. It was so well calculated, however, and so well executed, that all the ideal advantages were at once translated from terms of theory to terms of practical operation. It would never have been undertaken, and could never have been carried out, if the Americans had not had both the great ideal thinker and the trained corps of officers. It was the natural outcome of American institutions, which most of all governmental organizations provide a fund of public information and sentiment, and select with greatest discrimination the agents for effectuating the demands of the opinion thus created.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

CONTENTS

Frontispiece: Henry Dexter.	
Reminiscences of the Panic of 1857. By Henry Dexter	457
One Line of the Dana Family. By W. W. Spooner	461
The Louisiana Purchase. By Mrs. C. F. McLean	480
New York in the Nineteenth Century. By John Austin Stevens. (<i>Conclusion</i>)	500
The Origin of the Book of Mormon. By Theodore Schroe- der. (<i>Continued</i>)	518
Book Notices. By George O. Seilhamer	534

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE is issued on the fifteenth day each of January, March, May, July, September, and November, at Three Dollars per annum, Fifty Cents per single copy. Subscribers failing to receive their copies by the first day of the succeeding month should immediately notify the publishers; otherwise it may not be possible to supply the missing number.

The contents of each number are protected by copyright. Permission to reprint any article or illustration must be specially obtained from the publishers.

Advertising rates will be furnished on application; none but strictly high-class advertising matter will be admitted. Advertisements must be received by the fifteenth day of the month preceding the month of issue.

Application made at the New York Post Office for entry as second-class mail matter.

THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK,
Publishers,
41 Lafayette Place,
New York, U. S. A.

Copyright, 1906, by
THE PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK

All rights reserved.



HENRY DEXTER.

(From a Portrait in the New York Historical Society.)

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. I

NOVEMBER, 1906.

NO. 6

REMINISCENCES OF THE PANIC OF 1857.

BY HENRY DEXTER.¹

ISN'T it enough to bring the blush of shame to the cheeks of every American to learn of the grafting methods of some of the life insurance managements? The "Crimes of Amalgamated" sink into insignificance by comparison. As the whole truth in regard to these managements became known, many reputations were blasted.

Investigations are still going on quietly, and I have been afraid for many months that disclosures would be made that would result in a panic. I realize that the country is in an exceedingly prosperous condition, but it does not take much sometimes to create a panic. We are catching a number of Stenslands and Hipplees, and whenever we do I wonder how many more banks are controlled by just such men, and how long it will take to discover them.

There would not be so much cause for apprehension if the directors of banks and insurance companies attended to their duties. I would like to have a firm conviction that everything is sound and that we are as prosperous as we seem; but all these affairs take me back to the panic of 1857 and the events leading up to it, including the failure of the Ohio Life and Trust Company.

For five years before the failure, my business took me into the office of that company, on Wall Street between Broad

¹Mr. Dexter is well known to New York citizens as the founder of the American News Company and a benefactor of the New York Historical Society. He is now in his ninety-fourth year.

and William. I was not favorably impressed with the way business was being done there. The president of the company had been spending thousands of dollars in giving dinners for advertising purposes. Up to within a couple of months of the failure the stock of the company sold above par, and six months before they paid their regular dividend of 8 per cent.

I was then in business with my brother and Henry Whittemore in Nassau Street. I had felt for some time that things could not go on as they had been. My wife's uncle and a great many of his relatives and friends in Connecticut owned stock in the Ohio Life and Trust Company. I warned him to sell it, but he only laughed at me. He said his relatives, who were bankers in New York, advised him to hold it, that he had a good investment, paying eight per cent. I suppose he thought I would like to borrow the money, as I had just married his niece. He said, "If I should sell, what would I do with the money?" My reply was, "If you don't know what to do with the money, I would advise you to dig a hole in your cellar and hide it there until the storm blows over." He did not sell.

Finally money began to be tight, prohibitory rates being demanded for money on call. I had my eyes and ears open for everything that would show which way the wind was blowing, and I finally became convinced that something was going to happen soon.

I told my brother my fears, but he did not share them. I insisted, however, in drawing \$10,000 from the bank to have for an emergency.

We went to the City Bank. I went in to Mr. Van Deusen, the cashier, and said: "Van, I never have asked for a discount. You have several thousands of dollars of ours here, and as there is a cloud hanging over us and you are likely to break, I want to be protected. I want \$10,000 in gold."

"Make out thy check, and thee shall have it, Henry," said he, and passed it out. We put the bags under our coats

and went back to the store. Then each of us took some of it home and hid it away.

Just about two weeks after that my junior partner, Mr. Whittemore, went down into Wall Street. When he returned he was white and shaking. I inquired, "What's the matter?" "Oh," said he, "everything is going to smash; down in Wall Street men are running around in their shirt sleeves like mad; it sounds as if all hell was let loose." "Well, what of it?" said I; "we needn't worry, we're safe."

The crash had finally come! Just as when the first brick in a row falls and carries with it all the other bricks, so the failure of the Ohio Life and Trust Company involved most of the banks. Men were lined up in rows at the various banks swearing and fighting for the first chance to draw their funds. Some of the banks had guns from the Seventh Regiment brought into their buildings to have ready for an emergency. I remember at the Bank of America there was a particularly long line of depositors waiting to withdraw their deposits. The cashier informed the president that their funds were getting low. The president said: "Get up the kegs of silver; it is nearly three o'clock, and you can keep on paying until closing time." The cashier pointed to a keg on the floor and said: "That is our last keg!" The president, who was an old gentleman, was so shocked that he fainted there in the presence of the depositors.

This was the beginning of awful times. Every bank except the Chemical was obliged to suspend, and the legislature gave them one year's extension.

Things went from bad to worse. The Millerites accepted it as a sure sign that the millenium was at hand, and were all prepared, with their white robes, for their ascension. One man who "got religion" at that time came into my office and handed seventy-five dollars to the cashier, saying that some time previously the cashier had made an error

of that amount in his favor and he had kept it to himself, but that now his conscience troubled him and he wanted to make it right.

It would be a good thing if some of the directors of our institutions would "get religion," or an awakened conscience, which would make them attend to the duties of their positions, instead of grafting on the poor. Everyone who robs the widow and orphan of their heritage, or sits supinely by while another does it, should be put behind prison bars, no matter what his standing is or has been in the community. What we need is more old-fashioned honesty.

ONE LINE OF THE DANA FAMILY.

BY W. W. SPOONER.

RICHARD DANA, the ancestor of this family, was a settler in Cambridge, Mass., about 1640 (nine years after the first settlement of that community), and died in 1690, having had by his wife, Ann Bullard, seven sons and four daughters. In all respects the Danas may be fittingly characterized as one of the great families of the United States. "The lives and records of those who have perpetuated the family name," says an able writer, "are interwoven with the very life of the nation. They were soldiers and statesmen; hands that helped to lay the corner-stone of the republic; patriots who rallied at Bunker Hill, who responded again to the call of freedom in 1812, and who in our Civil War hastened to attest their right to the family name by a display of the heroic spirit of their sires."¹ In the varied departments of science and scholarship, literature and journalism, the legal, clerical, and medical professions, philanthropic and moral activity, the name of Dana has acquired distinction.

The origin of the family is involved in uncertainty. The conclusion in favor of a continental descent has been generally accepted by those who have given any attention to the subject, and this is in accord with all the family traditions. It is supposed that the father of Richard the emigrant, or his ancestors, came from France to England, and that he there joined the Puritan movement to the colonies. There is record of a "Ricr. Danes" (?)² who sailed from Gravesend for the West Indies in 1635, aged twenty.

¹Joseph D. Miller, in *Munsey's Magazine*, vol. xvi., p. 139.

²Danes or Dana? In the original entry the surname is not distinctly written, and may be Dana.

It has been supposed by some genealogists to be of interest that a member of the Dana Family in America adopted, about one hundred and twenty years ago, the armorial bearings granted by Queen Elizabeth to Willian Dane of Hertfordshire, of which the motto, *Cavendo tutus* (Safe by being cautious), is the same as that of the Cavendish Family, whose present head bears the title of duke of Devonshire. But it now appears that this William Dane was not a Dana, and that he left no descendants. It is needless to add that until the origin of Richard Dana the emigrant is ascertained, the right to a coat of arms cannot be substantiated.

I

RICHARD DANA was in Cambridge, Mass., as early as 1640, and resided there during the remainder of his life, a period of fifty years. His name occurs frequently in the early records, with every indication that he was a man of substantial property possessions and also of prominence and usefulness. At various times he held the local offices of constable, surveyor of highways, "tythingman," selectman, and grand juror. He died April 2, 1690.

Married, about 1647, Ann Bullard, who died July 15, 1711.
Issue:

1. John Dana, b. April 15, 1649, d. October 12, 1649.
2. Hannah Dana, b. July 8, 1651, d. previously to 1728. M. Samuel Oldham.
3. Samuel Dana, b. October 13, 1653, d. November 8, 1653.
4. Jacob Dana, b. February 2, 1654-5, d. December 24, 1698.
- 5 and 6. (twins), b. May 21, 1656, Joseph Dana, d. February 11, 1700; Abiah Dana, d. December 8, 1668.
7. Benjamin Dana, b. February 20, 1659-60, d. August 13, 1738.
8. Elizabeth Dana, b. February 20, 1661-2. M. Daniel Woodward.
9. *Daniel Dana*, b. March 20, 1663-4; of whom below.
10. Deliverance Dana, b. May 5, 1667, d. 1754. M. Samuel Hyde.
11. Sarah Dana, b. January 1, 1669-70, d. January 11, 1669-70.

II

DANIEL DANA, ninth child of the preceding, was born March 20, 1664 (calendar year), in Cambridge, Mass., where his life was spent. He was tythingman in 1700, surveyor in 1701, and selectman in 1715 and 1725. In 1736 he was one of a committee "of wise, prudent, and blameless Christians," appointed as a kind of privy council to the minister.

He died October 10, 1749.

Married Naomi Crosswell of Charlestown, Mass., daughter of Thomas and Priscilla (Upham) Crosswell. She was born December 5, 1670, died February 24, 1750-1.

Issue:

1. Thomas Dana, baptized March 25, 1694, d. 1752. Ancestor of the distinguished missionary, linguist, and diplomatist, S. Wells Williams, who accompanied Commodore Perry to Japan as interpreter.
2. Caleb Dana, baptized June 13, 1697, d. April 17, 1769. Ancestor of the eminent scientist, Professor James Dwight Dana, and his son, Professor Edward Salisbury Dana, both of Yale College; of the missionary, Rev. George Dana Boardman, and his son of the same name, the late distinguished clergyman of Philadelphia; and of Charles Loomis Dana, M. D., of New York, the well-known specialist in nervous diseases.
3. *Richard Dana*, b. June 26, 1700; of whom below.
4. Naomi Dana, b. August 7, 1702, d. March 14, 1725-6. M., June 21, 1722, William Upham of Weston.
5. Timothy Dana, b. April 16, 1705, d. May 3, 1705.
6. Priscilla Dana, b. March 10, 1705-6. M., 1st, August 24, 1727, Joseph Hill; 2d, May 15, 1740, Captain Samuel Gookin.
7. Ebenezer Dana, b. December 12, 1711, d. August 19, 1762.
8. Hepzibah Dana, baptized October 24, 1714. M., May 8, 1735, Samuel Hastings.
9. Daniel Dana, d. December 5, 1713.

III

RICHARD DANA, third son of the preceding, was born in Cambridge, Mass., June 26, 1700. He was educated at Harvard College, where he was graduated in 1718. He then

studied law, and was presently called to the bar, practicing in Marblehead and Charlestown and subsequently in Boston. In his profession he soon took the position of a leader, becoming, indeed, one of the most conspicuous practitioners in the colonies; and in the obituary notices published at his death he was spoken of as "the head of the bar." Judge Story, in his work on "American Precedents," cites more examples from him than from any other American pleader except Mr. Dana's brother-in-law, Judge Edmund Trowbridge.

Though frequently urged to accept political office, he preferred to devote himself to his profession. But he was one of the earliest to recognize the seriousness of the controversy between the colonies and Great Britain, and in his capacity as an influential private citizen was among the most determined and uncompromising advocates and supporters of the principles of American liberty. From the beginning of the agitation he "took a prominent part in the protests against the new and oppressive taxes imposed by the British parliament and the appointment of highly-paid crown officials." "He frequently presided at the famous town meetings held at Faneuil Hall and the Old South Meeting House, and was often on committees with the Adamses, Otis, Quincy, and Warren, preparing addresses to the patriots through the colonies and appeals to the king and parliament on the other side of the ocean." He gave his services gratuitously, as a lawyer, to town governments, committees, and individuals, advising them as to their rights. When the news of the passage of the Stamp Act was received in 1765 he was at the forefront of the movement started by the Sons of Liberty to prevent the enforcement of the obnoxious measure; and it was before him, as a magistrate, that Andrew Oliver, the stamp act commissioner, was brought and forced to sign the famous agreement not to carry out the law (December 17, 1765). Hawthorne describes the scene in "Grandfather's Chair," with

Richard Dana seated in the chair. He reported the papers of November, 1767, and May 8, 1770, which were celebrated in those times. Upon the occasion of the Boston Massacre he was appointed a member of the committee to investigate and report concerning that affair.

His tireless activities in behalf of his country were terminated by death in the midst of the struggle, May 17, 1772. His loss was regarded as one of the greatest deprivations to the cause of the patriots. President Adams afterward said that had his life been preserved he would have furnished one of the immortal names of the Revolution.

The personal characteristics of Richard Dana were thus described in a tribute to his memory in the *Boston Post* in 1772:

"He hated flattery; agreeable to the natural severity of his manners he was a most inveterate enemy of luxury and prodigality; a very sturdy, strenuous, and, it must be confessed, many times a passionate, opposer of all those from the highest to the lowest, but especially the former, who in his judgment were enemies to the civil and religious rights of his country; and he very well understood what those rights were."

His portrait, in wig and gown, painted by Copley, well indicates the forcible traits attributed to him. It is in possession of his great-great-grandson, Richard H. Dana of Cambridge, as is also the original of the agreement referred to above, with the signatures of Oliver and Dana.

Married, May 31, 1737, Lydia Trowbridge, daughter of Thomas and Mary (Goffe) Trowbridge, and sister of Judge Edmund Trowbridge. They were descendants of Thomas Trowbridge, from Taunton, Somersetshire, England, who settled in Dorchester, Mass., in 1636. She died at Newton, Mass., April 7, 1776, aged sixty-five.

Issue:

1. Lydia Dana, b. April 14, 1738, d. September 24, 1744.
2. Edmund Dana, b. November 15, 1739, d. May 7, 1823.
3. Henry Dana, b. August 12, 1741, d. March 14, 1761.
4. *Francis Dana*, b. June 13, 1743; of whom below.

5. Mary Dana, b. March 2, 1744-5, d. December 12, 1747.
6. Robert Dana, b. April 13, 1747, d. July 10, 1748.
7. Anne Dana, b. July 14, 1749, d. August 4, 1749.
8. Mary Dana, b. February 17, 1750-1, d. August 16, 1752.
9. Lydia Dana, b. January 26, 1755, d. May 2, 1818. M., December 7, 1783, John Hastings. To this line belong the noted writers and artists, William Hamilton Gibson and Charles Dana Gibson.

IV

HON. FRANCIS DANA, third son and fourth child of the preceding, was born in Charlestown, Mass., June 13, 1743. He was graduated from Harvard in 1762, and afterward spent five years in the law office of his maternal uncle, Judge Edmund Trowbridge, a pre-eminent jurist of that period, to whom Chancellor Kent refers as "the oracle of the old real law of Massachusetts." Called to the bar in 1767, he gave early promise of equalling the distinguished reputation of his father, in whose footsteps he also followed as an ardent advocate of American rights. He became one of the active spirits of the Sons of Liberty; and John Adams, in his Diary, makes mention of a club where "Lowell, Dana, Quincy, and other young fellows were not ill employed in lengthened discussions of the rights of taxation."

The death of his father in 1772 left him in possession of a comfortable fortune, which, says one of his descendants in a published review of his life, "he regarded as only increasing his opportunities for service in the public cause." From this time until the close of the war of independence he was uninterruptedly engaged in employments in the patriot interest. In 1773 he was professionally associated with John Adams in sustaining the cause of the Rhode Island patriots in the matter of the Rome and Moffatt letters. In 1774, upon the occasion of the departure of the royal Governor Hutchinson for England, he manifested his uncompromising spirit by vigorously opposing a complimentary

address to the retiring official which had been drawn up in the name of the Boston bar.

Possessing the complete confidence of the leaders of public sentiment in New England, he was selected by them to undertake a mission to England for the purpose of ascertaining the true feelings and disposition of the ruling classes upon American questions. Bearing confidential letters from Josiah Quincy, Joseph Warren, Dr. Samuel Cooper, and others, he sailed in April, 1774, and during the next two years applied himself to the important and delicate business with which he was intrusted. His inquiries in England were greatly facilitated by the advantage of his family connections through his elder brother, Rev. Edmund Dana, who was settled in a parish at Wroxeter (Shrewsbury), and had married a daughter of Lord Kinnaird, this lady also being a niece of Governor Johnstone and of Sir Wililam Pulteney, M. P., one of the largest landowners in the midland counties. The association which he thus acquired with the most prominent public characters of England afforded him every opportunity for forming an accurate judgment; with the result that he became firmly convinced of the impossibility of a reconciliation upon any satisfactory terms—an opinion from which he never after wavered. While in England he formed an intimate acquaintance with Dr. Price, to whose important work in behalf of the colonies, published in 1776, he contributed valuable materials.

Immediately after his return to America, in April, 1776, Mr. Dana took a letter of introduction to General Washington from John Adams, in which he was described as “a gentleman of family, fortune, and education, who has just returned to his country to share with his friends in their dangers and triumphs.” “He will satisfy you,” added the writer, “that we have no reason to expect peace from Britain.” This was at the crucial time of the whole dispute, when the question of independence was in its final stage. He at once exercised his whole influence in favor of that

step; and by the reports which he brought was instrumental in achieving the end so earnestly desired by the patriotic leaders. His advice had especial weight with his father-in-law, William Ellery of Rhode Island, who was a member of the continental congress and became a signer of the Declaration.³

In May, 1776, he was chosen a member of the executive council of Massachusetts, a position to which he was annually re-elected until 1870. He entered the continental congress in November of 1776, and in that body, though one of its youngest members, "his eloquence, combined with good legislative ability, business judgment, and high character," soon gained for him an influential position. He was made chairman of the committee on the reorganization of the army, and early in 1778 was chairman of the committee to visit the camp at Valley Forge, where he spent several months in consultation with Washington; from which resulted the formulation of conclusive plans, their adoption by congress, and their transmission to the commander-in-chief with instructions to proceed accordingly, "with the advice and assistance of Mr. Reed and Mr. Dana, or either of them." He participated in the framing of the articles of confederation, July, 1778; and in the same year was one of the congressional committee of three which acted upon and rejected the conciliatory proposals of Lord North. About this time the American Academy of Arts and Sciences was formed, and he was one of the founders and charter members.

Mr. Dana's important and valuable services in congress were brought to an end by his appointment, in September, 1779, as secretary of the embassy of John Adams, which was sent to Paris for the purpose of continuing and strengthening the French alliance, and with instructions also to hold

³For an account of the ride of Ellery and Dana to Philadelphia to congress in 1777, see T. W. Higginson's "A Revolutionary Congressman on Horseback," in *Scribner's Magazine*.

itself in readiness to negotiate treaties of peace and commerce with Great Britain. During the next year he was engaged in the business of this mission, and in addition assisted in raising money loans for the United States.

In March, 1781, he received from congress the commission of minister to Russia, being the first appointee to that post. Repairing to St. Petersburg, he devoted himself to his duties with assiduity and all discretion. The relations of the Empress Catherine with both Great Britain and France were at that juncture exceedingly critical. To have received Mr. Dana formally as a minister plenipotentiary from the United States would have been equivalent to recognition of American independence, and would have been regarded by England as an act of war. The empress expected, moreover, to be asked to serve as mediator between the warring powers, a capacity in which of course she could not have acted had she recognized our independence. Consequently, Mr. Dana was unable to obtain recognition in due form. This failure, however, was not unexpected. On the other hand, the main object of his mission to St. Petersburg—promotion of friendly understandings—was satisfactorily realized.

After the arrangement of the preliminaries of peace with Great Britain he obtained leave from congress and sailed for home, arriving in Boston in December, 1783. Two months later he was again sent as a delegate from Massachusetts to the continental congress; and during the recess of that body in 1784 he was one of the committee of the states, which administered the executive business of the confederation. In January, 1785, he was appointed to the office of justice of the supreme court of Massachusetts, and accordingly retired from congress. He was one of the chosen delegates of Massachusetts (1787) to the great convention at Philadelphia which framed the constitution of the United States; but on account of ill health and the pressure of his judicial duties was unable to attend. In the next year, how-

ever, he was a member of the state convention held to act upon that instrument in the name of Massachusetts; and it was very largely owing to his firm attitude and able advocacy that the voice of Massachusetts, so decisive of the fate of the constitution, was given in favor of its ratification.

Still continuing upon the supreme bench of Massachusetts, Judge Dana was honored by appointment (November, 1791) as chief-justice of the state. This distinguished position he retained, exercising its functions with the most signal ability and integrity, for the next fifteen years, when, having passed the age of sixty, he resigned and retired to private life. Meanwhile he had refrained from all political activity, although on three occasions he served as presidential elector. In 1797 he declined an appointment by President Adams as a special envoy to France with Pinckney and Marshall.

The memory of Judge Francis Dana should be treasured in his native commonwealth as that of one of the fathers of the republic; the equal in attainments, as in character, of the ablest and noblest of his contemporaries. "He possessed," says a biographical writer, "a high sense of honor and of public duty, was ardent and passionate in temperament, intolerant of timid or temporizing measures, of an active and energetic character, remarkable for his nervous and impressive eloquence, an acute and learned jurist, and an austere and dignified magistrate."

He resided at Cambridge, where he was a very extensive land-owner, and died at that place on the 25th of April, 1811.

Married, August 5, 1773, Elizabeth Ellery, daughter of Hon. William and Ann (Remington) Ellery of Newport, R. I. Her father, as already noticed, was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. Her mother was a daughter of Judge Jonathan Remington and a descendant of Governor Thomas Dudley and of Anne Bradstreet, "the

Tenth Muse." Mrs. Dana was born August 13, 1751, and died August 31, 1806.

Issue:

1. Edmund Trowbridge Dana, b. June 13, 1774, d. August 12, 1776.
2. Francis Dana, b. May 14, 1777, d. December 28, 1853.
3. Edmund Trowbridge Dana, b. September 26, 1779, d. May 6, 1859. He is remembered for his liberal benefactions, which resulted in the founding of the Dana Library in Cambridge. He had studied art in Europe, but did not make it a profession. Though he served as justice of the peace, he was not engaged in any active pursuits.
4. Martha Remington Dana, b. September 29, 1784, d. December 24, 1862. M. Washington Allston, the celebrated artist, June 1, 1830.
5. *Richard Henry Dana*, b. November 15, 1787; of whom below.
6. Elizabeth Ellery Dana, b. September 3, 1789, d. November 20, 1874.
7. Sarah Ann Dana, b. September 1, 1791, d. February 6, 1866.

V

RICHARD HENRY DANA, 1st, fourth son of the preceding, was born in Cambridge, Mass., November 15, 1787. He entered Harvard College in the class of 1808, but, participating in an insurrection of his class against the faculty, was obliged to leave the institution before graduating. Many years later his degree, as of 1808, was conferred upon him by Harvard. Removing to Newport, R. I., he completed his studies there under private instruction. Destined for the bar, he pursued legal studies in the office of his cousin, Francis Dana Channing, and subsequently at Baltimore, Md., with Robert Goodloe Harper. He was admitted to the Massachusetts bar in 1811, and about the same time became active in politics and was elected a member of the legislature.

But having decided preferences for literature, he soon discontinued his legal practice. In 1814 he became associated with a number of scholarly gentlemen of Cambridge

and Boston—including William Tudor and John Quincy Adams—in the Anthology Club, under whose auspices an unsuccessful magazine, the *Monthly Anthology*, had for some time been conducted. By the advice of Mr. Dana and other leading members this periodical was abandoned, and in its stead the *North American Review* was established, its first number being issued in May, 1815. This was the first venture of the kind, affording an adequate medium for the expression of American critical thought and literary culture, which enjoyed endurance; and the influence of the *Review* at once became and for many years continued supreme. Mr. Dana was associated with his cousin, Professor E. T. Channing, in its editorial supervision from 1815 to 1821. His earliest production, including an "Essay on Old Times" and a criticism of Hazlitt's "Lectures on the English Poets," appeared in its pages. In 1821-2 he published in New York, with the aid of contributions from the pens of Bryant and Allston, "The Idle Man," a miscellany, in six numbers, of tales, essays, criticisms, and poems, "which had marked literary merit, but received little encouragement from the public, and was discontinued." In 1825, at the age of thirty-eight, his first poem was published in the columns of the *New York Review*. This was followed in 1827 by a volume of "Poems," brought out in Boston. Of "The Buccaneer," the principal piece in this collection, Professor John Wilson ("Christopher North") said in *Blackwood's Magazine*: "We pronounce it by far the most powerful and original of American poetical compositions." In 1833 he issued (Boston) "Poems and Prose Writings," embodying his individual contributions to the "Idle Man," with some new poems. A portion of the latter work was published in London in 1844 with the title of "The Buccaneer, and Other Poems." In the years 1839-40 he delivered a series of lectures on Shakespeare in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. A complete edition of his writings, including his essays and literary

papers in the *North American Review*, appeared in two volumes in 1850.

The principal merit of Dana's literary work is its solidity and finish, qualities which are the distinguishing characteristics both of his critical writings and his imaginative productions. He is thus not to be regarded as one of the creative intellects of American literature; but on the other hand the refining and stimulating influence which he exercised is recognized with high appreciation by all students of the progress of culture in the United States. "His place in the history of our literature," it has been justly observed, "should be measured by the important service that a mind like his was able to render in the general cultivation of public taste in the formative period."

A portion of his literary activities was devoted to religious controversy. Reared in the Trinitarian faith, he was a Congregationalist, and for some ten years, throughout the prevalence of the Trinitarian disputation in New England, was a vigorous writer, in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, against the views of his cousin, Rev. William Ellery Channing. Subsequently he became an Episcopalian.

Much of his life was spent at his beautiful country seat at Manchester-by-the-Sea, on the shores of Cape Ann. He died in Boston, February 2, 1879, at the venerable age of ninety-one.

Married, May 11, 1813, Ruth Charlotte Smith, daughter of John Wilson Smith, Esq., of Providence, R. I. She was born November 18, 1787, and died February 10, 1822; a descendant of Rev. John Wilson, first minister of Boston, and niece of Abiel Smith of Boston, who founded at Harvard the Smith professorship of French and Spanish languages and literature (under which Longfellow and Lowell were so long professors), and also the first school in Boston for colored people.

Issue:

1. Ruth Charlotte Dana, b. February 28, 1814, d. September 23, 1901.
2. *Richard Henry Dana*, b. August 1, 1815; of whom below.
3. Edmund Trowbridge Dana, b. August 29, 1818, d. May 18, 1869. He was graduated from Vermont University in 1839 and from the Cambridge Law School in 1841. He practiced law with his brother in Boston for a short time, subsequently going to Europe, where he prosecuted scholarly studies, especially on the subjects of Roman civil law and history and philosophy in their relation to law. He received from Heidelberg University the degree of J. U. D., *summa cum laude* (1854).
4. Susan Dana, b. June 8, 1820, d. April 27, 1822.

VI

RICHARD HENRY DANA, 2d, known as Richard Henry Dana, Jr., eldest son of the preceding, was born in Cambridge, Mass., August 1, 1815. After completing his preparatory education he was sent to Harvard University, where, however, like his father, he incurred the displeasure of the faculty in consequence of a class rebellion and underwent "rustication" for a period of six months, which he passed at Andover under the tuition of Rev. Leonard Woods, afterward president of Bowdoin College. Suffering in his junior year from weakness of the eyes, he was advised by his physicians to make a sea cruise as a remedy, a suggestion which he eagerly embraced, having from boyhood cherished a romantic passion for the ocean. He accordingly shipped as a common sailor on the brig "Pilgrim" of Boston (August, 1834), for a voyage round Cape Horn to the western coast of North America. He returned two years after on the ship "Alert" and resumed his studies at Harvard, where he was graduated in 1837.

Later, while at the Harvard Law School, and an instructor in elocution at the college, he made time to write out the notes of the journal he had kept during the voyage, with a view to enlightening the public as to the situation of seamen in the merchant marine. The resulting production, "Two Years Before the Mast" (1840), was sent by

his father to William Cullen Bryant, who, besides according it his unqualified critical approval, undertook to find a publisher. It is interesting to recall that notwithstanding the recommendation of so influential a patron, the manuscript seemed for a time likely to remain on his hands, and when finally disposed of, to the Harpers, realized for its author only \$250. The book enjoyed immediate success, passing through numerous editions and receiving translations into many foreign languages. A reprint in England was adopted by the board of admiralty for general distribution in the navy. Upon the expiration of the copyright Mr. Dana renewed it in his own name, in 1869 issuing a new edition and adding a final chapter, "Twenty-four Years After," in which he gave an account of a second visit to California and made record of the destruction of the ship "Alert" by the Confederate "Alabama." Notwithstanding the illustrious subsequent career of Mr. Dana, it is by this simple narrative, the product of a youthful enthusiasm, that his fame will be perpetuated. "The simple and graphic story of a sailor's daily life, never so well told because a man with similar gifts and education seldom goes to sea before the mast," it has enjoyed an uninterrupted popularity to the present day, and occupies an assured position among the world's classics of adventure.

He was not, however, induced by the brilliant success of his book to devote himself to a literary career, but adhered to his choice of the more sober and reliable pursuit of the law, for which he had qualified himself under the preceptorship of Judge Story, in the Harvard Law School, and in 1840 had been admitted to the Massachusetts bar. Equally as an advocate, counsellor, and legal writer and lecturer he attained an eminent degree of distinction. He took an especial interest in maritime and international law, and in both of these departments was one of the leading authorities of his times. In 1841 he published a work on sea usages and laws, with illustrations of rigging, etc., entitled "The

Seaman's Friend," which was afterward reprinted in England as "The Seaman's Manual." In 1866, at the request of the family of Henry Wheaton, he undertook a revision of Wheaton's "International Law," which when published was accepted as the then ultimate standard, some of its notes being officially printed for the use of the Geneva tribunal. He received the degree of LL.D. from Harvard University in 1866, and the same year was appointed lecturer on international law in the Cambridge Law School.

In his political sympathies he followed the traditions of his family and the inclinations of a nature in accord with the prevailing sentiment of the north on the issues which led to the Civil War, being successively a whig, free-soiler, and republican. He gave much professional labor to the cause of the fugitive slaves, defending Thomas Sims, Anthony Burns, and the rescuers of Shadrach (1851). He acted as counsel for the United States in the prosecution of Jefferson Davis, and delivered the argument for the government in the United States supreme court on the "Prize Cases," the leading cases on war powers arising from the rebellion. In 1868 he was a candidate for congress against General Benjamin F. Butler, but was defeated. He was nominated to the senate (1876) by President Grant for minister to England. This resulted in an acrimonious controversy, into which extraneous issues were brought without opportunity being afforded to Mr. Dana for procuring their consideration on their merits; and the nomination was ultimately rejected by the senate.

Although his career was busily devoted to his profession and the so-called practical interests of life, he retained at all times an enthusiasm for general literature, and by his miscellaneous writings and addresses gave frequent evidences of the accomplishments of a resourceful and discriminating intellect. He was the author of a charming book, "To Cuba and Back," the record of a vacation trip. His eulogy upon Edward Everett has been pronounced

"one of the best specimens of commemorative eloquence." Among his notable public addresses were: "On the Outrage on Charles Sumner;" "State of National Affairs;" "Reconstruction of the Rebel States," and "The Faneuil Hall Address to the People of the United States." Two valuable sketches of biography on his kinsman, Professor Edward Channing, and on Major Vinton, are comprehended among his writings. He wrote an important letter on Italian unity, which, with similar contributions on the subject, was published in a volume entitled "Letters on Italian Unity, and the Relative Rights of Italy and the Catholic Church."

Mr. Dana died on a visit abroad, at Rome, January 6, 1882, and was buried in the Protestant cemetery there, near the tombs of Shelley and Keats.

Married, August 25, 1841, Sarah Watson, daughter of William and Mary (Marsh) Watson of Hartford, Conn. She was born May 6, 1814.

Issue:

1. Sarah Watson Dana. M. W. S. Swayne.
2. Ruth Charlotte Dana. M. Francis Ogden Lyman.
3. Elizabeth Ellery Dana.
4. Mary Rosamond Dana. M. Henry Fearing Wild.
5. *Richard Henry Dana*, b. January 3, 1851; of whom below.
6. Angela Henrietta Channing Dana. M. Henry Whipple Skinner.

VII

RICHARD HENRY DANA, 3d, only son of Richard Henry Dana, Jr., was born in Cambridge, Mass., January 3, 1851. He was graduated from St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H., in 1870, from Harvard University in 1874 (when he was class orator), and from the Harvard Law School in 1877. For three years he was stroke of the university crew, and for one year captain as well. His career has been devoted to the legal profession, in which he still pursues an active practice, as one of the leading members of the Boston bar. Soon after his graduation from the law

school, Mr. Dana was offered the post of secretary of the American legation at London, but declined; and to the preference for a private life thus indicated he has since adhered.

As a citizen he has been conspicuous, and has rendered invaluable service, in the promotion of movements and causes enlisting his sympathies, and in works of philanthropy. He drafted the Massachusetts civil service reform act of 1884, was editor of the *Civil Service Record* from 1889 to 1892, for several years served as president of the Cambridge Civil Service Reform Association, and is now chairman of the National Civil Service Council. He drew up the plan of the Associated Charities of Boston, which was organized at his house and under his chairmanship (1878-9). He was the author of the first Australian ballot law enacted in the United States (Massachusetts, 1888). At various times he has occupied the positions of president of the New England Conservatory of Music, president of the Boston Young Men's Christian Association, president of the Library Hall Association of Cambridge, and trustee and treasurer of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge. He was one of the three commissioners appointed by Governor Crane to consider the feasibility of the Charles River Dam. In 1904 he was chairman of the committee of the diocese for the general convention of the Episcopal Church, held in Boston in October. Mr. Dana has delivered frequent addresses, and is the author of numerous literary contributions on civil service reform, ballot reform, taxation, improved dwellings for the poor, and kindred subjects of reform, moral, and humane interest. His principal recreation is golf, and he is president of the Oakley Country Club.

His home is at Cambridge, where the Dana Family in his direct line has resided for seven generations.

Married, January 10, 1878, Edith Longfellow, daughter of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, the poet, and his wife,

Frances (Appleton) Longfellow (who was the daughter of Hon. Nathan Appleton of Boston) and a descendant of John and Priscilla Alden.

Issue:


1. Richard Henry Dana.
2. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana.
3. Frances Appleton Dana. M. Henry Casimir De Rham, 2d.
4. Allston Dana.
5. Edmund Trowbridge Dana.
6. Delia Farley Dana.

THE LOUISIANA PURCHASE.


BY MRS. C. F. MC LEAN.

GEORGE SAND says that to write a biography properly, one must go back at least a hundred years before the person is born. If such be true as regards the comprehension of the life of an individual, how much more necessary it is when we attempt to estimate the value and results of a great epoch in national life. To answer the question: What did we purchase, why did we buy, and how came we to buy Louisiana? as well as the consideration of the results accruing from such a purchase, we must perforce cast our eyes backward and summarize as briefly as possible the great events which led up to that epoch in our history, whose centennial we have celebrated by the great Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis in 1904.

It was during the latter part of the seventeenth century that Great Britain finally acquired the colonies of the Dutch in North America. Therefore at the beginning of the eighteenth century the European powers possessing large territory and colonies in North America were Spain, France, and England. The claims of these powers were based, first, on discovery, and secondly, on settlement. The discovery of a bay or inlet, or of a great river either at its mouth or source, gave to the country to which the discoverer belonged not only the bay or river, but what was called its watershed, that is, all the country through which that river flowed, and not only that country, but all the territory drained by its tributaries. We who know the wonderful course of our rivers, and especially that of the "Father of Waters" and his tributaries, can now hardly



Th. Jefferson



imagine the confusion caused by discoveries made from different directions of the many tributary streams of our great rivers. It is true, however, that not only by the discovery of the mouths of the rivers that empty into the Mississippi, but also by actual survey of many of them to or near to their source, the French had well established their claim to all the Mississippi Valley, and that the dominions claimed by the French king from the Canadian settlements on the St. Lawrence and the great northern lakes down past the tributaries of the Mississippi and to the Gulf of Mexico, were better founded than the claims of Spain or Great Britain to the territory held in their name.

All the vast region, therefore, that reached from the northern lakes down to the Gulf and east to the colonies of England on the Atlantic seaboard, was claimed by France under the name of Louisiana. Joliet, Marquette, and La Salle had given their life labors to the discovery and acquisition of this vast territory, but La Salle's tragic fate in 1687 had ended all efforts to colonize the country south of the Illinois until the last year of the seventeenth century, 1699. Louis XIV. was then on the throne of France, and the peace of Ryswick had given Europe a breathing spell that permitted a consideration of the claims of the distant colonies. The man chosen to transport men and supplies to colonize lower Louisiana was the Canadian naval officer, Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville. With him went out his brother, then eighteen years old, Jean Baptiste Le Moyne de Bienville, known ever after as the father of Louisiana. It would indeed be a congenial task to relate fully the adventures of d'Iberville and his followers, as sailing from the Gulf of Mexico through the wonderful mouth of the Mississippi, and up the Mississippi and through those two remarkable lakes which he named one Pontchartrain, after the minister of marine, and the other Mauripas after his son and secretary, but destined to be the prime minister of the future monarch, Louis XV.

At this time the Spanish were settled at Pensacola and other points in East and West Florida, and in Havana and Mexico, and as the dreams of d'Iberville were first of a domination for France of the Gulf of Mexico, he made the first French settlement on a quiet arm of the Gulf at Biloxi and at Mobile. Returning to France to present the needs of the settlement to the government, at Havana d'Iberville fell ill of a fever and died, so that in 1706, seven years after the founding, the struggling French settlements on the Gulf fell first to the care of Sauvole, and at his death to Bienville.

Now Bienville held to the opinion that, to retain French domination in Louisiana, the control of the Mississippi River was the necessary condition; and in his reports he reiterated the desirability of establishing on its banks a capital city. The spot chosen by him was the land lying between the river and the two lakes his brother had named. Shortly after the founding of Biloxi and Mobile, Louis XIV. sold all the monopolies of trading with these colonies and discovering of riches to a wealthy merchant named Crozat, and it was his representatives, who with the supplies and colonists, both men and women, brought the first additions to the populations that had come from Canada. However, Crozat retained his ownership and government only long enough to become bankrupt, and then the affairs of these colonists at the other end of the world were consigned, first, to a western company, and then to a western and India company. At the head of these two companies was the Scotchman, George Law, the colossal speculator and favorite of the Duc d'Orleans, regent of France.

France, literally and financially, having been bled nearly to death under Louis XIV., was then undergoing one of those financial inflations and periods of speculation that ultimately lead to widespread disaster. It was, however, in the days of the prosperity of the companies, that in February, 1717, Law sent out men, money, and supplies, and

with those new resources Bienville began to carry out his cherished scheme of establishing a capital city on the Mississippi. As there was already a city of Orleans in France, Bienville, desiring to name his capital after the regent, called it La Nouvelle Orleans. In 1721 the government and provisions were conveyed from Biloxi, out onto the Gulf, up to the pass of the Balize, to the embryo metropolis of the Gulf and the Mississippi Valley, La Nouvelle Orleans.

To titled people in France, great plantations were then granted on the banks of the Mississippi River above and below the settlement, and to people these so as to secure permanent possession, little discrimination was used in the selection of the colonists sent out to Louisiana. Jails and reformatories were emptied, peasants and wayfarers were kidnapped, and private grudges satisfied in sending settlers to the banks of the Mississippi. However, there were exceptions to that rule even then, for Law sent out a large company of German Alsatians, whose descendants, with Frenchified German names, still live in Louisiana. During all these first years of settlement one of Bienville's constant demands was for wives for his colonists and soldiers. The Canadians had brought their wives with them, but their daughters married Canadians, and the need of women was not fully supplied. After twenty-five years the Ursulines of Rouen sent out members of their order to establish schools and hospitals, and to their care ever afterward were consigned the girls sent out as wives to the colonists. As late as 1796, twenty years after our Declaration of Independence, these girls arrived in Louisiana, and the history of the good deeds of these Ursuline Sisters, extending down to our day, forms a fascinating page in the history of Louisiana.

Through one of those many machinations at court which so disastrously affected all the colonies in the new world, Perier was appointed governor over Bienville, who was at

first made lieutenant-governor. The French had forts on the Mississippi, the Illinois, and the Ohio; Natchez was a most important post. The Indian tribes surrounding these posts, in spite of the efforts of the English traders to incite them against the French, had up to that time remained friendly, and the Natchez Indians were not only remarkable for their sense of justice and loyalty but also for their desire to acquire all the arts of civilization. However, through the wretchedly wicked and unjust treatment of the Natchez Indians by the young French officers at this post, the Indians became hostile and the massacre of Natchez formed the beginning of wars with the Indians. Perier was so little able to teach the better principles of civilization to the Indians that after the massacre at Natchez he had six Indian captives, two of them squaws, burned on the public square at New Orleans. Bienville was recalled to France, and while there the Indian Company receded the colony of Louisiana to the crown. Then Pontchartrain reinstated Bienville as governor of the colony and recalled Perier. But there was bad blood between the Indians and the colonists, and although Bienville had previously managed them with tact and success, it was no longer possible to do so, and, as in our other colonies, it seemed as if only more torrents of blood could wipe out the first stain. The French, in their efforts to annihilate their enemies, the Natchez, called in the aid of other tribes and endeavored to profit by the wars of the Indians among themselves, but it was reserved alone for the English to excite savage tribes to exterminate white settlers of other nationalities.

Through a period of seventy years runs the history of Louisiana as a French colony, and no other section of our country gives a history so rich in incident, so remarkable in individual romance, so full of stirring adventure, great heroism, and kaleidescope changes as this early history of Louisiana. It is also a record of periods of blundering, of injustice, at times of indifference and neglect on the part

of the home government, of injustice to individuals and of those great disasters that can come to all communities when great and irresponsible power is vested in a few persons. Most of the disasters and trials came, of course, from the idea that was general in all the governments holding colonies in the new world, that the colonies existed for the sole benefit of the mother country, and to furnish opportunities to reward individual favorites for whom there were no good berths at home; such a plan tending to create contending factions in the colonies, much to their detriment. In Louisiana, whatever the character of the government at home, there was, as in Canada, a representative to attend to the finances, an intendant, separate from the governor, which, as in Canada, tended to its undoing.

However, through all the blunders, injustice, and mistakes, there runs one gleam of reason in the treatment of the colonies; and that was the recognition of the fact that whoever represented the home government, he would need a little aid from the principal people in the colonies, so that there was established from the first a superior council, where, in addition to the various officers of either the crown or the company, or of the crown alone, there appeared some representatives of the colonists themselves. There was also the right of everyone to petition the council and even the throne. There was, therefore in this French colony of Louisiana as well as in the English colonies of Massachusetts and of Virginia, a shadow or nucleus of representative government, which produced that willingness and capacity for self-government that made some of the governors, fresh from the palace at Versailles, write in terms of consternation of the independent and republican tendencies of the colonists. Nearly all the supplies for the colony during the time of the French possession came from the mother country. All the government representatives, with but few exceptions, were possessed with a desire to find treasures and a pathway to the East

Indies, and almost entirely neglected that cultivation of the soil which was in the future to bring untold wealth to the region then costing immense sums for its maintenance. Indigo and the extracting of wax for candles from the wild wax plant were the first agricultural pursuits. Later began the cultivation of cotton, and later still that of the sugarcane. But it was not until the Spanish possession that Etienne de Bore discovered the secret of extracting and preparing properly the juice of the cane, which then became the great staple of trade of Louisiana, until the later discovery of the cotton-gin made cotton king.

Another but fitful gleam of reason in the home government, that contributed to the prosperity of the colony, was the granting of special privileges of trade and commerce. At different times, during a period of ten years at a time, all taxes on imports and exports were removed. Charles Gayarre, the great historian of Louisiana, says we have learned the folly of taxing exports, and one day we may learn the equal folly of taxing imports, and that all that commerce needs is to be free. If there had not come the terrors, the slaughter, and the expense of war with the Indian tribes, through the advantages just stated, the prosperity of the colony would soon have lifted it as a burden to the home government—especially if to the good trade conditions there had been added an honest administration of the affairs of the colony and some stability as to its currency. But Louisiana had to suffer from periods of inflations and depression of paper money, as did France herself.

During forty years out of seventy of French domination, Bienville was in an official position in the colony. When not in Louisiana he was in France urging more effective measures for the welfare of Louisiana. There were other governors sent out, some of whose names are known to us through their connection with other events in our history. Villiers was one of the colonial governors, and it was to him

that Washington was compelled to capitulate—but on most honorable terms—at Fort Necessity. De Vaudreuil was one of the best governors of Louisiana, but he it was who, having been transferred to Canada, had the sorrow of surrendering that great dominion to the representatives of Great Britain.

Now to understand succeeding events, we must cross the ocean to the old world.

There a few individuals, called kings and emperors, played a sort of chess game of war, and when they lost they handed back and forth provinces, duchies and cities, and when these became exhausted they threw in a colony or two. When Louis XIV. had passed away in his old age, and his only surviving direct descendant, his great-grandson, was too young to reign, the Duc d'Orleans, as we have seen, became regent. After the regency, when Louis XV. became king in fact, and the colony of Louisiana reverted to the crown, France was drained and impoverished, and emerged from the war of the Austrian succession bankrupt, as much through the filtering process of corrupt officialism as through legitimate expenditure. Louisiana had been a financial burden, and its cost from the foundation of the colony at Biloxi in 1699 to 1769 is estimated directly and indirectly at fifteen to twenty millions of dollars.

We all know that Louis XV. was too busy breaking the heart of his wife and building palaces for a Pompadour or a du Barry than with the state of his colonies, so that it is not surprising that when he learned they needed more men and more money, he was willing to give them up. He determined, therefore, out of the pure impulse of his generous heart—so runs the treaty—to cede to his cousin Charles III. of Spain, the colony of Louisiana. Negotiations to that effect were first begun in Madrid in 1761 by the ambassador of France. But they were not completed until November, 1762, at Fountainbleau, between the Spanish ambassador and the Duc de Choiseul, minister of Louis

XV. Charles III. of Spain, the new sovereign and owner of Louisiana, was the most progressive monarch of the Bourbons of Spain. On the 13th of November, he finally accepted the present of the king of France, but the entire negotiations were kept a secret.

On January 1st, 1763, one of the great treaties of the old world, and important to the new, was signed at Ildefonso between the kings of France and Spain on one side, and the kings of Great Britain and Portugal on the other. By Article VII. of that treaty, France ceded to Great Britain the vast region of Canada and its dependencies, Nova Scotia and Acadia, and all other dependencies; also she gave in addition all that territory of Louisiana situated to the east of the Mississippi River, excepting only the island on which New Orleans was situated. Spain ceded to Great Britain her provinces of East and West Florida and all her dominions in North America, except the islands east and southeast of the Mississippi River. The boundary line extended to the middle of the stream. The right to navigate the Mississippi from its source to its mouth was then first accorded to the subjects of the English king. Of the little family compact by which Louisiana west of the Mississippi had been handed over to Spain, his Britannic majesty was not informed; such was considered diplomacy in those days. After the treaty it looked as though in this game of chess Great Britain had about swept the board.

When Louis XV. thus secretly ceded Louisiana west of the Mississippi and New Orleans to Spain, d'Abaddie had been the excellent governor of the colony, which under him had increased in tranquility and prosperity. It was not until April, 1764, that he received orders from France to deliver the colony to the representatives of the king of Spain. There was the greatest consternation in the colony when these orders became known, but before the arrival of any officer from Spain d'Abaddie died and Aubry became

governor. At this period of her history Louisiana received those expelled Acadians whose history is told in "Evangeline."

More than a year passed since d'Abaddie received his orders, and four years since the secret cession, when the great scientist, traveler, and writer of Spain, Don Antonio d'Ulloa, accompanied only by a small company of soldiers and three other officers, Don Estavan Gayarre, Loyola, and Navarro reached New Orleans. As the army of occupation had not followed him, d'Ulloa did not take formal possession of the colony, although the expenses were paid from the Spanish treasury, and Aubry instructed the French soldiers they were serving the king of Spain. However, d'Ulloa did not satisfy the colonists, and in 1766, just ten years before our Declaration of Independence, the French colonists rebelled and sent d'Ulloa out of the country. It was a bloodless revolution on their part, and the other Spanish officers remained in New Orleans. The colonists then sent to France L'Assassier to represent the superior council, St. Lette, the planters, and Milhet from the merchants, to justify their rebellion, and to beg the king of France to take back his colony of Louisiana. All in vain; not even the tears of Bienville, then eighty-four years old, could move the king or the king's minister, and soon after Bienville died of a broken heart.

Meanwhile, when d'Ulloa reached Havana, he met the Spanish transports sent out to him with eight hundred soldiers and a million dollars, but they returned with him to Spain. As time went on and no one came from Spain to claim the colony, and the colonists learned that France would not support their rebellion, they were less satisfied with their action. The Spanish officers remaining, became more and more acceptable, and when a Spanish fleet appeared at the Balize they hardly expected any severity as a result of their bloodless revolution. The officer sent to New Orleans to represent the majesty of Spain was Don

Alexandro O'Reilley, who arrived in July, 1769. By courteous acceptance of honors paid him, even by the leaders of the revolution in the superior council, all were lulled to security in the belief that the expulsion of d'Ulloa would not be punished. But when did Spain ever fail to punish? Nicolas Chauvin, de Lafreniere, Baptiste Nyou, nephew of Bienville, Villere, Pierre Caresse, Marquis, and Joseph Mihlet were arrested and tried for treason. Lafreniere has been called the Patrick Henry of Louisiana. Villere, in attempting to pass his guards to see his wife, was bayoneted, and the others were condemned to death by hanging. However, they could find no hangman, and perforce they were shot in the prison yard by a file of soldiers. Other men of prominence were imprisoned for a term of years, the property of all was confiscated, and all the documents and printed matter pertaining to the so-called rebellion were burned on the public square. As all these were the principal men in the colony and related by blood and marriage to a host of colonists and known and respected by all, the feeling caused by this bloody commencement of the Spanish occupation may be imagined, not described.

At the end of a year, O'Reilley was recalled to Spain, and a line of other Spanish governors succeeded him. In 1777, Don Bernard de Galvez was governor. We know that in 1776 was signed our Declaration of Independence, and soon thereafter the colonists of Louisiana learned of the rebellion of the English colonies. It seems fair to say here that the administration of Spain in Louisiana differed much from its government of the other American colonies, and, generally speaking, the affairs of the colony prospered under Spanish governors.

Slavery had been introduced in 1750, and the work of these slaves on the plantations had greatly contributed to the prosperity of the colony. During our War of the Revolution, in 1779, Spain declared war against Great

Britain, and then Galvez, Spanish governor of Louisiana, promptly captured Baton Rouge, on the east bank of the Mississippi, Menchac, the English trading-post nearest to New Orleans, Pensacola, and Mobile. In 1783, when there was signed at Versailles the treaty of peace to which was attached the autograph of our beloved Franklin, Great Britain lost not only all of her colonies on the sea-coast, but all her territory extending from Canada to the Gulf on the east bank of the Mississippi; and she was forced to relinquish to Spain both East and West Florida. That was the time Great Britain did not sweep the chess-board.

The section of North America then ceded to the revolted colonies of Great Britain, soon to become the United States of America, extended from the Atlantic to the middle of the Mississippi, south to the boundary of East and West Florida, north to Canada. All south of the Florida boundary and west of the Mississippi then belonged to Spain. The freedom of the navigation of the Mississippi River was ceded both to Great Britain and to the American colonies by that treaty, but not any advantages of trade.

At the time of this treaty, in 1783, the population of Louisiana was 31,433, of whom 5,000 belonged to New Orleans. The population of the slaves nearly equalled the whites. After our War of the Revolution there was a great emigration to the banks of the streams, the east tributaries of the Mississippi, and we know what hardy, enterprising, and forceful spirits settled in Kentucky and Tennessee and pushed ever on to the banks of the great river. At its mouth there was a city that held the road to the Gulf and the ocean, and not only did these western pioneers wish to be able to take their produce down the river, but they wanted the right to keep it there, to trade there; in fact, they wanted free trade in all that it implies, and they determined to have it.

There appeared in Kentucky at this time a remarkable

character, Wilkinson by name, and it was more than hinted to the United States government that this shrewd person was attempting to incite rebellion in Kentucky and Tennessee and to join with Louisiana to form an independent country. Whether these were more than rumors is not now known. By a treaty with Spain made in 1795, the boundary between the United States and the Spanish boundary was settled. Thirty-one degrees latitude south became our southern boundary line east of the Mississippi. By this treaty there was secured to Americans the right of deposit in New Orleans, and that of settling in Louisiana. In 1798 the United States took full possession of its territory on the east bank of the Mississippi, and Wilkinson was made governor of that territory called American Mississippi.

In 1797 Carondelet, Spanish governor, went to Mexico, and the new governor, Don Manuel Gayosi, began making annoying trade restrictions against Americans and Protestants. The right of deposit at New Orleans, which had been granted for three years with the promise of renewal for New Orleans and elsewhere, was withdrawn from the Americans. The excitement in Kentucky and throughout the valley of Mississippi was so great that the United States government was obliged to send troops to the Ohio. A great trade, one necessary not only to their comfort, but to their existence, had sprung up between these western settlers and New Orleans. This trade was carried on in flatboats, which, when unloaded at New Orleans, were sold for timber, and the crews made their way back over the country; it was many a year after those days that New Orleans was paved with the timber of these flatboats.

There had also been considerable emigration of Americans into Spanish territory. In 1800, through successful diplomacy, the United States government induced Spain to restore all the provisions of the treaty in 1795, and a greater rush than ever of traders and emigrants set toward New Orleans. However, when Don Manuel de Salceda became

governor and Morales intendant, Spain ordered that no more land should be granted to American settlers.

We must now, to understand the events that follow, go first to Europe and then to the seat of our government at Washington. France had passed through her great Revolution, and when the nineteenth century opened there was at the head of her destinies, as first consul, that consummate player on the chessboard of Europe, Napoleon Bonaparte, one who so often and so swiftly swept the board as to make the heads of the players and the onlookers fairly swim in watching him.

In 1801 Thomas Jefferson became president of the United States. During the stormy months of the constitutional convention Jefferson was in France at the head of a commission appointed at the close of the Revolution to make treaties of peace and commerce with foreign powers, and although often during the day of the convention Washington had wished for his presence and the aid his wisdom and experience would give, it was not until Washington became president that he was able to recall Jefferson. During Washington's administration he was secretary of state, during Adams's vice-president, and then in 1800 the people had answered the calumnies of Hamilton and his followers by electing Jefferson to the presidency. It seems now, in the light of subsequent history, that Jefferson's long residence abroad was one of those periods of preparation that Providence vouchsafes for his elect in his service. With an eye ever open and single for the good of his country, Jefferson left no opportunity unimproved to do her service. He made a large circle of personal friends with whom, on his return to America, he kept up a constant correspondence. The correspondents were many of them men of prominence, of nearness to seats of power, who could give him valuable information from direct sources. At the time when most of the others connected with the government felt that the country from the seaboard to the Mis-

Mississippi was of so vast an extent that no other boundary line but the Mississippi River would ever be desired, Jefferson's thoughts and hopes crossed the river to the vast regions beyond. He was also a philosopher. He felt certain that the military conquests of Napoleon were not destined to endure, and almost before it was hinted that Napoleon was going to force Spain to recede to France the colony of Louisiana, Jefferson wrote to our representative in France, Livingston, and to Rufus King in London, to watch closely the events, and if such a transfer did occur to see if there were not a chance to secure the city of New Orleans from Napoleon. About this time the national senate elected Napoleon as first consul for ten years; then it was that the imperial crown began to dance before his eyes.

When the Peninsular War between France and Great Britain and Spain was ended, defeated Spain gave back the colony of Louisiana, though the treaty was not proclaimed, and only gradually it became known in both Europe and America. The effect on the Americans of the Mississippi Valley was not only disturbing but threatening, and one historian says that "only that respect for law which the people have when they make their own laws, prevented the westerners from sailing down the Mississippi and taking New Orleans." Hurriedly Jefferson dispatched Monroe to help Livingston in the negotiations concerning the threatened occupation of Louisiana by the French. When he reached Paris matters had greatly changed. Napoleon's fleet, that he had made ready to take possession of Louisiana, was prevented from sailing by the British fleet, and Napoleon felt so sure that Great Britain intended to send another fleet to secure the coveted mouth of the Mississippi that he knew there was no time to lose to checkmate his enemy. He therefore decided to sell to the United States not only what was asked, New Orleans, but all the territory that remained of the once vast region called Louisiana. After several interviews and some haggling over the price,

the compact was signed by Napoleon and his minister Talleyrand on one side, and Monroe and Livingston on the other, by which for twenty millions of dollars the United States acquired Louisiana. When Napoleon signed the treaty he said: "I give up to the United States this vast territory of France in America, but I thus give to Great Britain a rival that will yet humble her not only on land but on the sea." That prophecy was made before the War of 1812.

In ninety years, dating from the founding of New Orleans, the province had changed hands six times.¹ Before deciding on giving up Louisiana to the United States Napoleon had dispatched Loussat as his prefect to New Orleans to prepare for the taking possession of Louisiana for France. The Spanish governor, Caso Calvo, had not received his instructions from his own government, and, pending their arrival, to add the little comedy touch that comes with every tragedy, the two indulged in what is called in the history of Louisiana the battle of dinners, when each tried to dispose the colonists in favor of his government.

When the great news of the success of the negotiations in France reached Jefferson, he called a special session of congress to ratify the treaty and to make appropriations of money and other arrangements necessary to take possession of the new territory. Just twenty-one days before the arrival of the American commissioners and forces, the Spanish governor, having received his instructions, with great ceremony lowered the Spanish flag from the flagstaff on the Plaza and hoisted the tricolor in its place. A company of old soldiers who had in their youth served under the flag of France joyfully took the principal part in that cere-

¹From the agent of the governor to Crozat in 1712; from Crozat to the Western and India Company in 1717; from this company to Louis XV. in 1731; from Louis XV. to Spain in 1762; from Spain to France in 1801, and from France to the United States in 1803. It was the territory of New Orleans till 1812, when it became a state.

mony. General Claiborne and Governor Wilkinson were appointed by congress to receive Louisiana on behalf of the United States. The Ursuline sisters in the convent at New Orleans had become so alarmed at the prospect of Louisiana being returned to the infidel republic of France that all but nine had embarked for different Spanish convents. The nine remaining then became more alarmed at coming under the Protestant government of the United States. They appealed to Jefferson for protection; to that letter he answered in his own hand in French in most courteous phrases—a treasure preserved in the convent with almost adoration to this day. It is small wonder, then, that those who under his instructions were to take possession of New Orleans and Louisiana, should have accomplished their mission with perfect decorum and consummate tact.

The American officers and troops encamped outside the city, and then informed both the French and Spanish officers they awaited their arrangements to enter the city. Meantime the municipal affairs had been placed in charge of a committee of citizens, a proof that the ideas of self-government were understood in Louisiana as well as in our other colonies. On the 30th of November, 1803, the Spanish flag was once more flung to the breeze on the Place d'Armes as the French called it, "La Plaza" as the Spanish named it; and on the three sides of this then magnificent square the soldiers of Spain, of France, and of the United States stood under arms. On the fourth side the Plaza gave an unobstructed view of the majestic waters of the Mississippi, there making its crescent sweep above the city of New Orleans. The Spanish flag slowly descended the flagstaff amid booming cannon and rattling musketry, and then the French tricolor rose in its place; as the flag of France descended it was met midway by the stars and stripes, and for a few moments the two emblems floated together, while again sounded the stirring salutes. Then the starry banner mounted to the top and its folds were

flung to the breeze. As the French flag reached the ground, the old soldiers received it, and with it at their head marched away. As they passed the lines of Americans every soldier stood at attention and every officer bared his head.

How General Claiborne governed the new territory of Louisiana, how on July 4, 1806, he managed to fitly celebrate the day at New Orleans, how, when at the end of its term as the territory of New Orleans, that territory became the state of Louisiana and Claiborne was elected its first governor, how he married a beautiful Creole, how French, Spanish, French and Spanish creoles, became at length Americans, how the French and Spanish languages were not suppressed, but English slowly filtered through to become the language of business and judicial proceedings, would be a fascinating story to review, but too long to receive more than mention here.

It will be recalled that Louisiana, as returned to France by Spain, then ceded to the United States, meant all the vast territory west of the Mississippi River and extending to the very source of all its tributaries. Jefferson, who knew perfectly well the propensity of Great Britain to stretch her boundary lines, especially if there were any good thing on the other side, hastened to obtain from congress an appropriation for the survey of the newly-acquired territory, especially in the northwest. For the French *coureurs de bois*, American fur-trappers, and Indians had given glowing accounts of the vastness of that region and of the number and volume of its great rivers. Lewis and Clark were sent to the northwest, and then they announced that the Missouri was really the main stream and the upper Mississippi its tributary. Lewis and Clark penetrated to and surveyed the Columbia River, and none too soon claimed that region for the United States. None too soon, for not long thereafter a man, Whitman, made the solitary journey from the Pacific to Washington in the dead of

winter to relate how Great Britain was preparing to take possession of the valley of the Columbia. Just in time our forces reached the northwest, and the country now included in the states of Oregon and Washington was saved to the United States. It will be recalled that at the end of the Revolution Great Britain had returned Florida to Spain; it was not until 1821 that the United States finally succeeded in purchasing that territory from Spain; the map of the United States was rounding out. France had always claimed that Louisiana extended to the Rio Grande, but never could make good her claim against Spain. After our purchase of Louisiana came as a result the bloody but glorious chapter of the history of Texas, which led up to the Mexican War, when our flag in honor went up over the palace of the Montezumas and in greater honor came down again; then the Rio Grande became our boundary line. During two centuries and more the Spanish had mission settlements on the Pacific coast and in the fertile valleys to the northwest of the Rio Grande. It is to another chapter of our history that belongs, but no less dependent on and logically succeeding our Louisiana purchase, the acquisition of California. The map then looked complete.

The immediate political result of the purchase of Louisiana was the retention in power of the party of Jefferson during several administrations. The success attending the war on the Algerine pirates and the peaceful acquisition of the vast territory of Louisiana had made him the idol of his countrymen. Like Washington he could have had a third term as president, but like Washington he as firmly refused it. Madison and Monroe, the two succeeding presidents, were his pupils, and it was to Jefferson at his home in Monticello, as well as to Adams in Quincy, that Monroe wrote for advice before penning that famous message called the Monroe Doctrine. The Declaration of Independence proclaimed our independence, the message of Monroe secured it.

The commercial and social changes following on the Louisiana purchase are written in those pages of our history that sound like the tales of the Baron Munchausen. The trade on the Mississippi increased to wonderful proportions; in 1812 the first steamboat sailed down the river to New Orleans, and, what was the marvel of the day, with almost equal ease sailed up again. In 1821 there were 287 arrivals of steamboats at New Orleans. The year of 1812, as many as 6,000 flatboatmen trooped through the streets of New Orleans at one time, and there arrived there 1,500 flatboats and 500 barges. The year after the acquisition of Louisiana there sailed down the Ohio and the Mississippi two gaily decorated barges whereon were Aaron Burr and a hundred followers. At New Orleans his dream of empire came to an end when he was promptly arrested by General Claiborne.

NEW YORK IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BY JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS.

Fifth Paper.

BEGINNING OF GREATER NEW YORK—TRANSPORTATION PERIOD —GREAT EVOLUTIONS IN CONSTRUCTION, LOCAL TRANSIT, AND BUSINESS METHODS—NEW YORK AN IMPERIAL CITY.

*(From a historical address.)*¹

THE fourth and last quarter of the century was the most remarkable in many ways, as great in the fulfillment as the first was in the promise of development. At its close we find the opening of a new transformation scene in the grand drama; the beginnings of Greater New York, a new experiment in metropolitan government, a consolidation of forces which demands for its successful operation a more perfect union of its population, a closer connection by bridge and tunnel of its widely separated boroughs, boroughs whose habits differ, but which must be welded into a harmonious whole.

¹These papers have been arranged from one of a course of historical centennial addresses read before the New York Historical Society in 1901. They were prepared from the exhaustless material to be found in the library of that institution.

I must here acknowledge my obligations to Mr. Robert H. Kelby, the present librarian of the New York Historical Society, for his intelligent and courteous assistance in the line of research. Trained by his accomplished brother and predecessor, and brought up for a half century in the atmosphere of the Society, he maintains the old traditions of this venerable institution, whose services to the city of New York in its century of existence have never until quite recently received the financial aid to which it has been entitled. *Meliora spero.*

Before entering upon this phase of the comprehensive study, the field of which is too vast for other than summary statement, a word in general is appropriate on what has been happily styled "The Wonderful Century."

Mr. Bancroft, in an address in 1854 on the semi-centennial of the New York Historical Society said that the period thus commemorated, the first half of the nineteenth century, was unequalled in its discoveries and its deeds, and had done more for man's instruction and improvement than all which went before. He cited some of those discoveries which have changed the face of human society and set in new order the history of man and the march of his development. In the very opening of his brilliant oration he made the emphatic assertion that "Man is but the creature of yesterday, and fifty years form a great length in the chain of his entire existence;" an assertion the error of which has since been sufficiently shown by the acknowledged certainty that man existed with many animals extinct for countless ages.

Summing up the achievements of science in the last hundred years, we find, in locomotion, the steamship, the railroad, and the bicycle; in labor saving, the sewing-machine, the typewriter, and the reaper; in communication, the telegraph and the telephone; in comfort, the sulphur match, the electric light, and gas; in art, the photograph, the phonograph, and the Roentgen rays. Of the discoveries of all preceding ages are the Arabic numerals, alphabetical writing, printing, the mariner's compass, the steam engine, the telescope, the barometer, and the thermometer. In this enumeration no regard is paid to theoretical discoveries, such as gravitation, circulation of the blood, etc., but only to those which have changed the material face of modern life, and these latter are only now touched upon because of their early and complete application and use in our city. For it was here, in the first half of the century, that steam was applied to an extent which changed the nature and

speed of locomotion by land and sea, adding to and improving physical communication between man and man; and in the second half of the century it was here that the wonderful discoveries by the telegraph and telephone, that have brought mental communication to a point of development in which time is no longer an element, have received their greatest impulse. And it was here again that the sewing-machine and the typewriter, both American inventions, had their first general practical use, and here also that the bicycle had its beginning. The automobile was as yet in conception only.

Mr. Bancroft, in the address above alluded to, noted that our country "stands, more than any other, as the realization of the unity of the race," and it seems indeed as though that problem were to be solved on this hemisphere. Certainly in the fusion of the last half-century the two great strains of addition to our national blood, the Irish and the German, have lost much of their original type, while altering that of the city at large. In recognizing, a half-century ago, that the world was just beginning to take to heart the principle of the unity of the race, Mr. Bancroft observed that the human mind tends not only towards unity but universality—a truth which the experience of the period under examination amply demonstrates. For beyond all periods in our history it has been a period of consolidation, which is but a form of unity. It is the problem of the day whether this consolidation of numerous establishments of the same nature into one, under the name of trusts, is for the benefit or the detriment of mankind. That everything affected by them, either food supplies or appliances of comfort, is cheapened, is not to be denied. The serious doubt is whether the concentration of labor may not affect the results of individual application in the discovery of new forms of perfecting machinery. It is history that the great inventions which have economized labor have been made by individuals to ease their own work. The true objection

to trusts, however, is not to their principle, but to their application. Unless rigidly controlled by law, and their financial operations regularly open to inspection, they supply a most dangerous medium for speculation and fraud, enabling their directors, who alone are aware of the true value of their stock, by their own dealings in it, to affect that value for their own benefit. Indeed, on a late occasion the financial head of one of these great trusts, when pressed to show how it could declare dividends when the manufacture was being carried on at a loss, boldly confessed that there were other ways of making money than by industrial product; an intimation that the directors were speculating in the company's stock for its own benefit. It would seem but right that if a profit resulted at the expense of any part of the stockholders, legislation should control such an abuse.

This tendency of modern civilization toward concentration is equally to be observed in other than the material lines. We need only mention the amalgamation of our great libraries and the general union of people of all creeds in large schemes of charity and beneficence, and finally the union for the general purposes of New York and its adjacent counties of the five boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond in that Greater New York, some account of which will close our study.

Before entering upon this crowning theme, something must be said of the distinguished features of this latter period. First must be noted the chief cause for its wonderful advance—the financial development of New York, until from being the money center of the United States it is now challenging London as the money center of the world, that point at which the exchanges of the eastern with the western nations will be shortly settled. Already at the close of the century our bankers and insurance companies were found subscribing to Russian railway loans, the British war loan, and the Mexican national loan, a thing before

unheard of in our history. Fortunately this advance has been upon absolutely sure lines. We have noticed the depression at the close of the third quarter of the century—that of 1873 and 1874—and its cause, the contraction of the circulating medium by the funding of the United States debt, temporary and permanent; a severe process, which, though a temporary disaster, can, in view of what followed it, be hardly considered a calamity. We had to learn by bitter experience the final cost of too great a departure from a metallic basis in our issues of paper, and it is not too much to say that our unexampled prosperity today is due to our great metallic reserve. At the time of the crisis in 1873 the superintendent of the mint declared the amount of gold in the country to be one hundred and thirty million dollars, and of silver five millions—an estimate concurrently arrived at by other persons. In 1900 we had over a thousand millions in gold, over six hundred millions in silver, and somewhat over five hundred millions in uncovered paper, legal tenders, and national banknotes; so that in the single quarter of the century we have risen from being the poorest of the great nations of the world in metallic stock to the first place, our holdings of gold and of silver and of both together considerably exceeding those of France or Germany or of England.

It is a matter of profound regret to those who still adhere to the principles of the great masters of finance—Gresham, Gallatin, and others,—as practiced in France, in England, and the United States, that our financiers at Washington have seen fit to depart from the policy under which we have so prospered and at the very hour when they could so easily and safely, without friction, have placed the country on a metallic basis, *i. e.*, gold and silver directly, or through their direct representatives, gold and silver certificates. They have made a new departure of a flood of banknote issues only limited by the amount of United States bonds outstanding, and, not satisfied with this expansion, now

threaten us with a further issue of national banknotes based upon their assets, that is, individual promises to pay.

Specie payment was declared and actually resumed on the first of January, 1879, by the United States treasury. Whether it could have been maintained by the community, or even by the government, but for the exceptional conditions of our foreign trade for the year preceding, and those immediately following, is doubtful. The excess of exports over imports suddenly brought Europe into our debt. Gold flowed hither in liquidation to the amount of three hundred million dollars in the three years, and since then the balance of trade² has been annually almost without exception in our favor, reaching in the remaining years of the quarter of the century several thousands of millions; a balance which has been liquidated by the return of American securities, government bonds, state bonds, city bonds, railroad bonds, and gold. Moreover, this condition has enabled us during the same period to hold the entire product of our own gold mines. It could not be otherwise than that New York City should share in the general benefits coming from such large movements of merchandise and the precious metals through its port.

The foreign trade of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, is reported at \$2,429,232,786, of which \$1,168,785,559, nearly one-half, was of New York. This included the movement of coin and bullion, \$85,650,182, of

²It has been absurdly claimed that this balance of trade in favor of the United States has been offset by the freights paid foreign carrier vessels. But as it is a well-known axiom that the consumer pays the cost of the goods, in which of course that of transportation and freight is included, it follows that the foreigner pays the freight, whether on his own or American ships. With the exception of the Irish, now small in number, the cost of whose passages are usually remitted from this side of the water, the foreign immigrant pays his own transportation. There remains, therefore, as an offset only the freight on our own importations and the transportation of American travelers in foreign vessels; a large sum certainly, but small compared with the enormous balance of trade. This is another of the "fads and fancies" of our statistical sciolists, like that of the "famous endless chain," which served as an apology for the dicker with private bankers for treasury gold. Yet the cost of the Civil War was met by individual and bank subscriptions without any such questionable measure.

which \$27,215,797 was through New York. And here a word may be said as to whether it be not possible for the financiers of Europe and America to devise some plan by which this perpetual crossing and recrossing of the Atlantic of large sums of gold may not be avoided. Now that the United States holds such a large share of the precious metallic stock, it would seem feasible that a mutual system of credit between the New York clearing house, the Bank of France, and Bank of England might avoid other than a single annual liquidation in coin.³ Of the foreign trade of New York in the same period, \$1,024,613,977 is reported to have been carried in foreign vessels, and \$140,638,207 in American vessels, a disproportion in foreign favor which it is now in our power to check and which it is our duty to turn to our own benefit.

There have been several shocks in this period, to which passing notice must be given. The first of these was in 1884, when the passing of its dividends by the Louisville and Nashville Railroad brought about a general decline in railroad securities, from which some of them did not rally for a long period. But as the country was in a generally prosperous condition, the disturbance was confined to Wall Street, and general confidence in values was not shaken. Real estate was not affected. The year 1886 was one of the most speculative in our history. Over one hundred millions of shares of stock and thirteen hundred millions of other securities, representing nearly eleven thousand millions of dollars, changed hands at the New York Stock Exchange. The wheat crop was sold three times over on the New York Produce Exchange. The cotton crop was sold five times at the Cotton Exchange. But for

³The magnitude of the financial operations of which New York was the center, may be seen in the record of transactions of the New York Clearing House, where the exchanges for the business year ending October 1 are found to have been twenty-eight thousand millions in 1895, and to have risen to fifty-two thousand millions in 1900 (\$51,964,588,572). The balances in 1895 were nearly nineteen hundred millions, in 1900 over twenty-seven hundred millions (\$2,730,441,810).

the solid strength of our financial system, the December panic on Wall Street this year would have been a national disaster. Our metallic basis saved us. We had no longer a pitiful sum of gold and silver (one hundred and thirty-five millions together), but our paper currency, which had not been extended since that fatal year 1873, now rested on nearly one thousand millions of gold and silver, over nine hundred millions of which was gold. In round numbers the paper currency, legal tenders, national banknotes, and treasury certificates of gold and silver deposit, were eight hundred and twenty-five millions, resting on a metallic basis of nine hundred millions. Moreover, the anarchy problem had been settled for this continent. The social problem thereafter was in process of quiet solution, and the general verdict of the American people as to the right of the individual to work as he will, where he will, and when he will, undisturbed either by his fellows or by his employers, was then rendered. The security thus given to the people of New York for the investment of capital in new enterprises was beyond measure; but for that verdict American capital, now employed at home, might have sought foreign investments. In this year there was suggested the policy of uniting New York and all its environs under one general scheme of municipal rule. Already the liberation of capital, by the payment of the national debt, had been turned to the expenditure on a large scale in the improvement of the city by private individuals, especially in the erection of residences, probably not equalled, certainly not surpassed, in modern days, in any of the capitals of the world.

The year 1893 was also a trying year, the country feeling the sudden change in its economic system caused by a change in national administration. The gold reserve of the treasury had fallen below the danger point, and only the old plan of the New York Clearing House to issue loan certificates bridged over the catastrophe, which was so

serious for a short time that even the closing of the Stock Exchange was proposed. But as money became dear, gold began to flow in from Europe, and with an importation of thirty million dollars the financial sky cleared. And so healthy was the banking interest at large that no respectable bank closed its doors. And once again, toward the close of the century, 1899, there was a third, sudden, and great fluctuation in values, the natural sequence of three years of enormous prosperity. In this crisis the values of many of the over-capitalized combinations of stock fell to a point below their original values before combined. While disastrous to the imprudent, this disturbance had no serious effect on the community at large, except as a warning. It perhaps checked numbers of the ingenious schemes by which the earnings of honest industry are, at recurring periods, drawn from safe keeping into the hands of wily promoters of schemes more often visionary than practical.

Quite as remarkable as any other outcome in the development of the character of the city has been, in the last quarter of the century, the sudden revival of an American spirit which had been for so many years dormant that it was not believed to exist; and New York was even reproached as being an alien city, as being a city whose growth was not from American germs, whose prosperity was not from American intellect and labor, and which cared nothing for tradition, took no pride in past history, and in its worship of mammon had no longer reverence for the works of the fathers, of the founders of the republic. Her story had been written by foreign hands, and her soil, intellectual and moral, was, as it still is, a chosen field for missionary labors. But lo! a sudden change.

The interest of all the United States had been aroused by the great exhibition in Philadelphia on the centenary of Independence. The first response of New York to the

beating of the historic pulse which sprang from this celebration, was the commemoration by the New York Historical Society in September, 1876, of the battle of Harlem Plains, when John Jay made his scholarly oration on the very field of the fight; and thereafter to the close of the centennial period there were special commemorations of the great events during the revolutionary struggle in this state. The adoption of the state constitution was celebrated in 1877, when Mr. Charles O'Connor made his masterly analysis of the changes in our organic law. An elegant reception was tendered to the French delegates to the Yorktown centennial in 1881 by a state commission, and finally in 1883 occurred the grand outburst of patriotic sentiment on the anniversary of the evacuation of the city by the British, an occasion on which the population of our foreign and native wards vied with each other in their displays, and which was notably distinguished by the extraordinary enthusiasm of the old American wards, such as the ninth. Not even those best acquainted with the character of our population dreamed of the possibility of such a demonstration under the trying circumstances of the day, an unceasing downpour of November rain.

Later, and of a far more imposing character, was the centennial in 1889 of the formation of the United States government and of Washington's inaugural, a ceremony unique in its character among the many historic pageants of the world, with a military display in which the troops of every state in the Union, marshalled under the great rival leaders of the Civil War, joined in harmonious rivalry.

Nor was this display of American spirit confined in New York City to outward manifestations in processions and banquets. It was shown in a more permanent and useful manner by the founding of societies to develop and perpetuate that spirit. It was here in New York that the Sons of the Revolution, the first practical society of this nature,

was formed. Its conception was in 1875 in the rooms of the New York Historical Society, and it was organized in the Long Room of the historic Fraunce's Tavern, where Washington bade farewell to his officers, on the centennial of that interesting scene, the fourth of December, 1883. It had countless followers in societies of both sexes.

The next notable celebration in the city was that originated and carried out by the New York Chamber of Commerce in April, 1893, to commemorate the discovery of America by Columbus. A committee raised by the Chamber, with the assistance of the state department, sent invitations to every foreign city in which there was an American consulate, tendering the hospitalities of New York to any delegations or individuals they might accredit. Headquarters were established at the Waldorf, the opening of that magnificent structure occurring at the time. The Chamber invited the co-operation of the New York Historical and New York Geographical Societies. The ceremonies were opened by the reception of the duke de Veragua, his lady, and suite, which was followed by an afternoon reception conducted by a hundred ladies of representative New York families old and new, and a hundred gentlemen ushers, with five thousand invited guests gathered to meet the distinguished visitors. A later ceremony was a banquet given to the visiting admirals and officers of the foreign fleets in our waters. The Chamber of Commerce conducted these entertainments, which were on a most lavish and elegant scale. The municipality of the city, aided by a munificent donation of money from the state, also gave a reception and great ball to the representatives of the Spanish crown, the Princess Eulalia, and the duke and duchess and other distinguished guests.

I have before alluded to the rapid and continuous growth of New York since the Civil War as a manufacturing center.

The influx of foreign immigration⁴ has brought in a great number of skilled artisans, and these have usually remained with us, while such as had been accustomed to agricultural pursuits left for the interior. This artisan class to-day is one of the chief factors in our wealth.

While the wide Hudson, with its unbroken water surface, is one of the great avenues to the city, that very uniformity of surface will always prevent its use as a water power for manufactures, which require dams and falls to turn machinery. Therefore, though we may never compete with the cities which have the benefit of such power in the making of cloth, yet we have captured a large share of the hand industries. In fact, it seems as though we were sufficient unto ourselves and that with the raw material which we draw from an infinite variety of sources, domestic and foreign, we supply about every need of our population.

In the progress of the century there has been occasion to note the modifications which the immigrant races have undergone through the influence of our institutions and of our own antecedent type. The antagonism which the enormous influx aroused in our native American population was the cause of much turbulence, and it was hard to say whether the native or the alien was the more disorderly. So great was the jealous antagonism that political parties were broken asunder by it. To-day there is hardly a trace of the old race prejudice. Again, the gifts of the most valuable sites in our city to the Roman Catholic Church, and the attempted interference by persons of that faith with an Orangemen's procession, aroused popular passion to a dan-

⁴The immigration into the city of New York had already begun to show some startling changes in its character toward the close of the nineteenth century. In the six years 1895-1900, both inclusive, it reached the enormous figure of 1,492,253—nearly a million and a half souls. It may here be noted that the disproportion in immigration has steadily increased; for of the 850,632 immigrants landed in the city of New York in the calendar year 1905, the number from southern and southeastern Europe was 608,478, against 99,249 from the English islands and Germany.

gerous point, and politicians skilfully availed of the dissension for their purposes. To-day an appeal to religious prejudice would fall on idle ears. Not much more than a decade has passed since the German anarchists abused the freedom of speech and the press, and by meetings and processions attempted to excite disorder. To-day in our city they could not muster a corporal's guard. Every man is allowed to sit under his own figtree in peace, so he do not disturb the peace of his neighbor or poach upon his neighbor's figs.⁵

Once more, as in each of the previous quarters of the century, the city was stirred at its close by a war. The enlistments in the war with Spain showed she had lost nothing of her old martial spirit. The gallantry of her sons on the field revived the memory of their fathers a century before, and the parade in honor of the great naval victory of Manila Bay, in the perfection of its arrangements, the decoration of the streets, and the vast concourse of people which it attracted, was one more witness to the complete achievement by the city of its imperial destiny. It is a pity indeed that the grand triumphal arch erected on that occasion was not perpetuated in its variety of architectural design and the originality and beauty in its detail of decoration, to the end that with the Washington Arch, another gem of commemorative architecture, it might be to the New York of the twentieth century an object lesson of the progress of our own century in the highest form of art. Public

⁵The total population of the city of Greater New York by the census of 1900 was 3,437,202. By boroughs: Manhattan, 1,850,093; Bronx, 200,507; Brooklyn, 1,166,582; Richmond, 67,021; Queens, 152,999. The foreign-born population was 1,270,080. The control and education of this at present alien element presents difficulties which will tax our patience and resources to a fearful extent, the more so when we consider the gross ignorance of the later immigration. In 1900 there were in round numbers 322,000 Germans, 275,000 Irish, 145,000 Italians, and 155,000 Russians (mostly Polish and Russian Jews); added to these, 87,000 Austrian and Bohemian immigrants in a single year—forty-one per cent. Irish and Germans against all other nationalities admitted. These proportions have greatly changed since the twentieth century opened. Today the city is a new babel of tongues.

monuments from the time of the Pharoahs have been the silent monitors of time. In all countries and all climes, from the earliest day when mankind began to take a pride in its achievements, they have served to mark the measure of its civilization.

The route of the procession of 1899 is of itself an instructive study, as showing the increase and displacement of the population of the city. The military procession of the Cincinnati to commemorate the death of Washington in February, 1800, was entirely below the line of Chambers Street. The parade at the celebration of the opening of the Erie Canal in 1825 moved up Broadway no higher than Broome Street. That of 1858, a torchlight march, culminated at the Crystal Palace on Union Square. In this generation the limit has been gradually extended. That of Evacuation Day, 1883, began at Central Park and ended at the Battery. That in honor of the Dewey Manila victory began at Grant's Tomb and ended at Washington Square.

As was stated in one of the previous papers, the New York merchant princes are no more. Those enterprising men whose ships carried the stars and stripes on every sea, and who owned their cargoes, were of necessity familiar with the habits of every foreign nation, their needs present and prospective, and their commercial customs, all of which implied a broad education, many of them in foreign tongues. With the loss of the carrying trade, a consequence of the Civil War, their occupation was gone. The lines of the two great waterways which clasp New York in their arms are no longer studded with forests of masts carrying the American flag. In the place of commerce trade has assumed as great an importance. The ancient institution, the Chamber of Commerce, is now but a board of trade; its leaders are the great grocers, drygoods jobbers, and captains of industry, who are engaged in every variety of enterprise. The department stores, veritable bazaars where every kind of human products is to be found, have revolutionized the

entire system of business. Many of the largest have numerous subordinate stores for distribution of their supplies. Their enormous structures at the angles of transit have changed the physical face of the city. In the period now under review we have seen the beginnings of rapid surface transit, and before the century closed the development of New York had already outgrown the capacity of the surface and elevated roads, and the subway was already in process of construction. The changes which are resulting are not within the limits of this paper—even an enumeration. To-day, in 1906, we are in the midst of an upheaval not only in Manhattan, but in all the adjacent boroughs, far exceeding that made in Paris by Hausmann, in the days of the second empire, and perhaps those made in Rome by Augustus Cæsar, who proudly said he found Rome brick and left it marble, transforming it into an imperial city of palaces. Our constructions, however, or rather those which promise to be permanent, are not for residence. Indeed, it seems probable that before the first quarter of the twentieth century closes Manhattan Island proper will be entirely occupied by business structures. Central Park will not long hold its own as a favorite fashionable quarter. The swarms of population which seek the recreation of this great breathing space will soon make it as unattractive as Washington Square is to-day, and what once seemed a broad expanse is now minimized by the tall buildings which environ it to what seem inadequate proportions for the purpose it was designed to serve.

The institutions of learning in 1800 were limited. There was yet but one college, Columbia (old King's), on the block between Church, Barclay, Chapel, and Murray streets, and one free school attached to Trinity Church. From the beginning of the public school system of education in the city first proposed by the Society of Friends and inaugurated by De Witt Clinton, there has been an unceasing effort for its development, always avoiding any sec-

tional teaching. The number of enrolled pupils in the city of New York in 1900 was over half a million. The number of educational buildings was one hundred and eighty-two, in which two hundred and twenty-two schools were held for both sexes.

The church statistics show that in 1800 there were twenty-two churches of various denominations, of which one was Roman Catholic, on Manhattan Island. In 1900, in the boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx, there were nineteen separate religious sects with five hundred and twenty-five places of worship, cathedrals, churches, meeting-houses, and synagogues. The synagogues were thirty-eight in number, and the Roman Catholic churches ninety-two. Many of the structures are of a high order of architecture and adorned with costly examples of the applied arts.

In buildings the most important factor is at present the apartment hotel. The first was constructed in 1900. Within two years over one hundred of these buildings, all of a superior character, were built. The last innovation, at the present writing, is the construction of single or separate buildings covering entire blocks, the entire service of heating and artificial lighting being supplied from a single central structure. The enormous economy of this plan, with its reduction of manual service, is patent.

The valuation of real and personal estate, December 31, 1900, in Manhattan and the Bronx, is stated at \$2,799,871,672, of which \$2,369,999,504 was real and \$429,874,168 personal. In Greater New York, including the five boroughs together, real and personal, \$3,654,122,193; exempt from local taxes, \$74,296,699.

After a review of the progress of New York City in the wonderful century the inquiry is as to its future. But of the future the bard has told us, "The best of prophets is the Past." That the human mind, whose wings have soared higher and higher in these last hundred years than in all the hundreds which have preceded them, has now but entered

the upper atmosphere, is certain. And seemingly each step in inventions throws off some of the chains that have barred the freedom of the progress of mankind. Yesterday it was a direct application of the sun rays as a mechanical power without the secondary use of latent energy by steam; to-day it is the wireless telegraphy to unlimited distances. All of the great forces of nature, so far as known, unless it be the magnetic force, have been already harnessed and controlled for our uses. And now the waves of the air and the waters of the sea are, like the earth, to convey our thought instantaneous in time. The rate of speed for personal conveyance by steam on land or water seems to have reached its desired limit. Travel through the air is yet an infant science. But it is no less certain in the future than that by land or sea. That there are to be as great changes in domestic economy by the application of the discoveries of chemistry to the production and preservation of food as have been found in the use of gas in heating and of electricity in lighting, seems equally sure. The storage of power will change the conditions of home life.

To what field, then, is the prophetic vision to turn? Is the region of spiritual existence to be cleared from doubt and mortal vision to pierce "As far as angels ken"? Is the creature of this planet so far to master the conditions of its atmosphere as to reach the denizens of other globes, to communicate perhaps with our next door neighbors in Mars? Who may say? Who dare deny? There is an old theory that nothing that is within the conception of man is beyond his power of ultimate realization. Where, then, the limit to his aspirations? It seems more probable, however, that the great discoveries of the last century of the second millenium will be of a theoretic nature, in the elaboration of those discoveries yet in their infancy, the molecular theory of gases, the ascertaining of the definite proportions of chemical combinations by the atomic theory, and perhaps through the double improvement of the tele-

scopic lens and enlargement of the microscopic lens, and, most important of all, the discovery of some surface which will take a photographic transfer without that interference which has resulted from the fabric of all plates yet invented. The face of Mars may yet be closely seen.

Look where we will, as through a glass darkly, we see the rising of mysterious shapes which will take definite forms as the dawn of the new century brightens into day; and such has been the crop of past wonders in that from which we are now emerging, startling though the new may be, they will create no more surprises to our children than have the marvels of our own time to ourselves. The very idea of a limit to human progress has been long discarded.⁶

⁶The readers will have noticed the numerous omissions in these papers. The subject is too vast for even summary treatment. A thorough account of the general transformation the city has undergone, and is still undergoing, demands a description of the old, which no longer exists, as well as of the new, which is as yet unfinished—a double task. The coming year will be the anniversary of the laying out of the new city of New York by the commissioners. It will be a proper time for a picture of the greater city as it now is.

THE ORIGIN OF THE BOOK OF MORMON.

BY THEODORE SCHROEDER.

(Continued from p. 396.)

From Spaulding to Rigdon

WHEN we digressed from the main lines of our argument, Spaulding's rewritten story had been traced into the hands of Robert Patterson, a Pittsburg publisher, and this prior to Spaulding's death in October, 1816. If the manuscript was never returned to Spaulding after its second submission to Patterson, then what became of it? John Miller, who knew Spaulding at Amity, bailed him out of jail when confined for debt, made his coffin for him, and helped lay him in his grave, says Spaulding told him "there was a man named Sidney Rigdon about the office [of Patterson], and they thought he had stolen it" [the manuscript].⁴⁵

The Rev. Cephus Dodd, a Presbyterian minister of Amity, Pa., as well as a practicing physician, attended Spaulding at his last sickness. As early as 1832, when Mormonism was first attracting general public attention, and two years prior to the publication of Howe's book, in which Spaulding's story was first ventilated, this Mr. Dodd took Mr. George M. French of Amity to Spaulding's grave, and there expressed a positive belief that Sidney Rigdon was the agent who had transformed Spaulding's manuscript into the Book of Mormon. The date is fixed by Mr.

⁴⁵Gregg's "Prophet of Palmyra," 442; (date, January 20, 1882.) See also "Times and Seasons."

French through its proximity to his removal to Amity; hence the date given is probably correct.⁴⁶

The conclusion thus expressed by Mr. Dodd in advance of all public discussion or evidence is important, because of what is necessarily implied in it. First, it involved a comparison between Spaulding's literary production and the Book of Mormon, with a discovered similarity inducing conviction that the latter was a plagiarism from the former. This comparison presupposes a knowledge of the contents of Spaulding's rewritten manuscript. The second and most important deduction is to be made from the assertion that Sidney Rigdon was the connecting link in the plagiarism. Such a conclusion must have had a foundation in Mr. Dodd's mind, and could have arisen only if he was possessed of personal knowledge of what he considered reliable information creating a conviction in his mind of the probability of Sidney Rigdon's connection with the matter. This conclusion, if not made on independent evidence, in all human probability had no less significant foundation than a confidence in the accuracy of Spaulding's expressed suspicion to the effect that Rigdon had stolen the manuscript from the printing office. Thus accounted for, Dr. Dodd's statement has less force than if presumed to have been made on independent evidence, yet it confirms Joseph Miller's statement that Spaulding suspected Rigdon, and that suspicion must be accounted for by those who deny Rigdon's presence in Pittsburg prior to 1821.

How about Sidney Rigdon?

Was Spaulding's expressed suspicion that Rigdon had stolen his manuscript from the printing office well founded? We can never know upon what evidence the accusation was made, but we may inquire into the probative force of such

⁴⁶"History of Washington County, Pa.," by Patterson. "Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" p. 10.

new corroborative evidence as has been adduced since Spaulding's death.

Sidney Rigdon was born February 19, 1793, in Piny Fork of Peter's Creek, Saint Clair Township, Allegheny County, Pa.,⁴⁷ which place is variously estimated at from six to twelve miles distant from Pittsburg. At least until 1810, that being the date of the death of his father, and his own eighteenth year, Rigdon remained on the farm with his parents.⁴⁸

According to the Mormon account, Rigdon was licensed as a Baptist preacher fourteen years before becoming a Mormon.⁴⁹ This would make the date 1816, the same year in October of which Spaulding died, it being Rigdon's twenty-fourth year, and the same year in which he stole from the publishing office of Patterson the manuscript of Spaulding, if the latter's suspicions shall prove well founded. A very opportune time, be it observed, for the giving of attention to religious subjects.

According to another account, and perhaps the more accurate one, Rigdon joined the Baptist Church May 31, 1817,⁵⁰ a Welsh clergyman, Rev. David Phillips, being his pastor.⁵¹ This church was located near where the neighboring hamlet of Library is now situated. Rigdon "began to talk in public on religion soon after his admission to the church, probably at his own instance, as there is no record of his license."⁵²

The following year (1818) Rigdon left the farm and took up his residence and the study of divinity with the Rev. Andrew Clark at Sharon, Beaver County, Pa.,⁵³ where, in

⁴⁷"The Spaulding Story Examined and Exposed," by John E. Page, 7. Supplement 14, *Millennial Star*, 42. "Myth of the Manuscript Found," 24.

⁴⁸Supplement 14, *Millennial Star*, 42.

⁴⁹35 *Saints' Herald*, 130.

⁵⁰"Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 8. "Myth of the Manuscript Found," 24.

⁵¹Supplement 14, *Millennial Star*, 42 and 43.

⁵²"Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 9.

⁵³"Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 8, 9.

March, 1819, he was licensed as a Baptist.⁵⁴ I am informed by Sidney Rigdon's son that in 1818 his father made a lengthy visit to Pittsburg. In May, 1819, Rigdon moved to Warren, Trumbull County, O., where, in July, he took up his residence with the Rev. Adamson Bentley, later of "Disciple" fame,⁵⁵ and was here ordained a regular Baptist preacher.⁵⁶ While thus situated Rigdon met, and on June 12, 1820, married Phoebe Brook,⁵⁷ who was a sister to Mrs. Bentley.⁵⁸ Rigdon continued his preaching hereabouts, not appearing to have any regular charge until February, 1822. In November, 1821, he received a call from the First Baptist Church of Pittsburg, which was accepted, active duties commencing February, 1822,⁵⁹ and according to Joseph Smith ended August, 1824, at which time Rigdon was expelled for doctrinal error.⁶⁰ Another account fixes the date of his being deposed as October 11, 1823.⁶¹ Thereupon Rigdon, Alexander Campbell, and Walter Scott organized the "Christian Church," otherwise known as "Disciples"—and, with his following, Rigdon secured the courthouse in Pittsburg in which to do his preaching, at the same time working as a journeyman tanner⁶² with his brother-in-law, Mr. Brooks.⁶³ Mr. Lambdin, through whom Rigdon is supposed to have secured access to the Spaulding manuscript, and of whom more shall be written later on, died August 1, 1825,⁶⁴ and in 1826 Rigdon returned to Bainbridge, Geauga County, O.⁶⁵ Here he soon met Orson Hyde,

⁵⁴Supplement 14, *Millennial Star*, 42 and 43.

⁵⁵Supplement 14, *Millennial Star*, 43.

⁵⁶"Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 9. Supplement 14, *Millennial Star*, 43.

⁵⁷Supplement 14, *Millennial Star*, 43.

⁵⁸"Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 12.

⁵⁹"The Spaulding Story Examined and Exposed," 4, by J. E. Page. "Mormonism Exposed," 2, exact date, January 28, 1822.

⁶⁰Supplement 14, *Millennial Star*, 43.

⁶¹"Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 8.

⁶²Supplement 14, *Millennial Star*, 44.

⁶³"The Spaulding Story Examined and Exposed," p. 8.

⁶⁴"Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 7. "Myth of the Manuscript Found," 26.

⁶⁵Supplement 14, *Millennial Star*, 44. 5 "Times and Seasons," 418.

who became a student of divinity at Mr. Rigdon's, with a view, as Hyde says, of entering the ministry. Except for a little "Campbellite" preaching which he did under Rigdon's guidance, Hyde never appears to have entered any ministry except the Mormon. In 1829 Hyde became a boarder in Rigdon's family, and in 1830⁶⁶ he was almost miraculously converted to Mormonism, and still later became one of the first "Quorum" of apostles in the Mormon Church. Rigdon died July 14, 1876.⁶⁷

Rigdon's Prior Religious Dishonesty

There are two circumstances of the above narrative which need a little further elucidation, since the impressions which Rigdon made upon his discerning intimates during his earlier life may have some bearing upon the force to be given to the circumstantial evidence concerning his after life.

As to Rigdon's conversion to the Baptist Church so very soon after the time when Spaulding expressed the suspicion that Rigdon had stolen his manuscript, the Rev. Samuel Williams, in his "Mormonism Exposed," says: "He [Rigdon] professed to experience a change of heart when a young man, and proposed to join the church under the care of Elder David Phillips. But there was so much miracle about his conversion, and so much parade about his profession, that the pious and discerning pastor entertained serious doubts at the time in regard to the genuineness of the work. He was received, however, by the church and baptized by the pastor with some fears and doubts upon his mind. Very soon, Diotrephes-like, he began to put himself forward and seek pre-eminence, and was well-nigh supplanting the tried and faithful minister who had reared and nursed and led the church for a long series of years. So

⁶⁶"The Spaulding Story Examined and Exposed," 10.

⁶⁷*Historical Record*, 992. Bancroft's "History of Utah," 202.

thoroughly convinced was Father Phillips by this time that he was not possessed of the spirit of Christ, notwithstanding his miraculous conversion and flippant speech, that he declared his belief 'that as long as he [Sidney Rigdon] should live, he would be a curse to the church of Christ.' ''⁶⁸

Concerning Rigdon's expulsion or resignation from the Baptist Church, the Mormons declare that it was caused by Rigdon's refusal to either accept or teach the doctrine of infant damnation. Dr. Winter, in the course of a historical notice of the First Baptist Church of Pittsburg, says: "When Holland Sumner dealt with Rigdon for his bad teachings, and said to him: 'Brother Rigdon, you never got into a Baptist church without relating your Christian experiences,' Rigdon replied: 'When I joined the church at Peter's Creek I knew I could not be admitted without an experience, so I made up one to suit the purpose; but it was all made up and was of no use, nor true.' This I have just copied from an old memorandum as taken from Sumner himself."''⁶⁹

The first of these accounts was published in 1842, the last in January, 1875, and Rigdon lived until July 14, 1876. While one H. A. Dunlavy of Lebanon, O., did, in the March number of the same paper, publish an apology for Rigdon by way of answer to the article of Dr. Winter, yet neither Dunlavy nor Rigdon ever denied the facts alleged therein. We must, therefore, accept the facts stated as true, and they fasten upon Rigdon such religious dishonesty as establishes his willingness to be a party to a religious fraud in kind like the one here charged against him.

This, then, brings us to the question of what, if any, opportunity Rigdon had for stealing Spaulding's manuscript from Patterson's publishing office.

⁶⁸"Mormonism Exposed," by Williams, copied in "Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" page 13.

⁶⁹"Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 13. *Baptist Witness* (Pittsburg), January 1, 1875.

Rigdon had Opportunity to Steal the Manuscript

It has been frequently charged that Sidney Rigdon lived in Pittsburg and was connected with the Patterson printing office during 1815 and 1816. To this charge Rigdon, under date Commerce (Ill.), May 27, 1839, makes the following denial:

"It is only necessary to say in relation to the whole story about Spaulding's writings being in the hands of Mr. Patterson, who was then in Pittsburg, and who is said to have kept a private printing office, and my saying that I was connected with the same office, etc., etc., is the most base of lies, without even the shadow of truth. There was no man by the name of Patterson during my residence in Pittsburg who had a printing office; what might have been before I lived there, I know not. Mr. Robert Patterson, I was told, had owned a printing office before I lived in that city, but had been unfortunate in business and failed before my residence in Pittsburg. This Mr. Patterson, who was a Presbyterian preacher, I had a very slight acquaintance with during my residence there. He was then acting under an agency in the book and stationery business, and was the owner of no property of any kind, printing office, or anything else during the time I resided in that city. If I were to say that I ever heard of the Rev. Solomon Spaulding and his hopeful wife until Dr. P. Hurlburt wrote his lie about me, I should be a liar like unto themselves."⁷⁰

The evidence upon which is based the charge of Rigdon having a permanent residence in Pittsburg during the years in question, or his connection with Patterson's printing office, is so unsatisfactory that these issues must be found in favor of Rigdon's denial, even in spite of the fact that his evidence is discredited by reason of the conclusion as to his guilt, which is to be hereafter set forth, and his personal interest.

Rigdon, it will be remembered, lived within from six to ten miles of Pittsburg during the years in question. Pittsburg was the only town of consequence, and the family's place of buying and selling. Rigdon would of necessity

⁷⁰"Spaulding Story Examined and Exposed," 11 and 12. "History of the Mormons," 45 and 46. "The Mormons," 34. "Braden-Kelly Debate," 94. "Plain Facts Showing the Falsehood and Folly of the Rev. C. S. Bush," p. 14 to 16.

make many friends in the city, and it would not be strange if almost everybody knew him and he knew all of the prominent citizens. In 1810 Pittsburg had only about 4,000 inhabitants, and in 1820 had but 7,248.

The very prevalent notion as to Rigdon's connection with the Patterson publishing establishment must have had some origin, which, in all probability, would be Rigdon's close friendship for some who were, in fact, connected with it. Upon this theory only can we account for such a general impression.⁷¹

It might be well, before entering upon that subject, to fix in our minds Patterson's business mutations. In 1812 Patterson was in the book business in the firm of Patterson and Hopkins. They had then in their employ one J. Harrison Lambdin, he being a lad of fourteen. January 1, 1818, Lambdin was taken into the partnership of Patterson and Lambdin, which firm succeeded R. and J. Patterson. R. Patterson had in his employ one Silas Engles as foreman printer and superintendent of the printing business. As such, the latter decided upon the propriety, or otherwise, of publishing manuscripts when offered. The partnership of Patterson and Lambdin "had under its control the book store on Fourth Street, a book bindery, a printing office (not newspaper, but job office, under the name of Buttler and Lambdin), entrance on Diamond Alley, and a steam paper mill on the Allegheny (under the name of R. and J. Patterson)."⁷² Patterson and Lambdin continued in business until 1823. Lambdin died August 1, 1825, in his twenty-seventh year. Silas Engles died July 17, 1827, in his forty-sixth year. R. Patterson died September 5, 1854, in his eighty-second year.⁷³

⁷¹"Who Wrote Book of Mormon?" 11.

⁷²"Myth of the Manuscript Found," 26. "Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 9.

⁷³"Who Wrote Book of Mormon?" 7 and 9. This covers all Patterson's migrations.

Rigdon's Only Denial Analyzed

Let us now analyze Mr. Rigdon's denial of 1839 as quoted above. Rigdon was an educated man, a controversialist in religion, and at the date of the denial he was also a lawyer. Therefore we are justified in holding him in a strict accountability for all that is necessarily implied from what he says or omits to say, as we could not, in justice, do with a layman.

Rigdon's first denial is of the "Story about Spaulding's writings being in the hands of Patterson." This story is established by the evidence already adduced and some besides, even to the satisfaction of most Mormons.

The negative of this proposition Mr. Rigdon, if he was a stranger to the office, as is claimed, could not possibly assert as a matter within his own knowledge. If Rigdon had in his mind any fact upon which he justified this assertion, it could only have been a knowledge that the manuscript was at the printing office of Buttler and Lambdin, not knowing that that office was controlled by Patterson.

The second denial in Rigdon's statement is: "There was no man by the name of Patterson during my residence in Pittsburg who had a printing office." The foregoing account of Patterson's business affairs is made up from the information possessed by Patterson's family and an employee. It must, therefore, be accepted as correct. Here again Rigdon's denial can be accounted for by assuming his ignorance of Patterson's interest in the printing office known as Buttler and Lambdin. Rigdon's son says Rigdon lived in Pittsburg in 1818. Church biographers allege that he preached there regularly after January 28, 1822. During 1818 and 1822 Patterson was in the printing business, and Rigdon's statement must be deemed untrue.

Howe, in his "Mormonism Unveiled,"⁷⁴ did, as early as 1834, charge that Rigdon had been "on intimate terms"

⁷⁴p. 289.

with Lambdin. This statement in many forms has been very often republished since, and between 1834 and 1876, the year of Rigdon's death. During these forty-two years Rigdon never recorded a denial. That fact may, therefore, be taken as true. If Rigdon was on terms of intimacy with Lambdin, and Lambdin, at the time of that intimacy, as is clearly established and undenied, was connected with Patterson in the publishing business, Rigdon, being intimate with him, must have known something of Patterson's business, and assuming his mental faculties unimpaired, he, in the statement under consideration, must have told what he knew was untrue, justifying himself by the apparent evidence in his favor that Patterson's printing office was not run in his own name.

Rigdon's third matter of denial relates to his own admission of a connection with Patterson's printing establishment. This denial we must accept as true, since no one to whom he is alleged to have made the admission has ever recorded his evidence, and the hearsay statements without certainty of origin are too indefinite to be entitled to weight.

This paragraph above quoted and thus analyzed absolutely denies nothing in the remotest degree essential to the real issues involved in the charge of plagiarism under investigation, and is absolutely the only recorded public denial ever made by Rigdon, though from 1834 to 1876 he was almost continually under the fire of this charge, reiterated in various forms and with varying proofs.

Rigdon and Lambdin in 1815

Heretofore we have argued that by his silence Rigdon admitted his intimacy with Lambdin, successively Patterson's employee and partner from 1812 to 1823. The early writers all treated the intimacy between Rigdon and Lambdin as a matter apparently too well known to need proof. Yet we need not rely upon that, nor even Rigdon's

failure to deny, since more definite evidence has been preserved.

Mrs. R. J. Eichbaum, under date of Pittsburg, September 18, 1879, leaves us this very convincing statement:

"My father, John Johnston, was postmaster at Pittsburg for about eighteen years, from 1804 to 1822. My husband, William Eichbaum, succeeded him, and was postmaster for about eleven years, from 1822 to 1833. I was born August 25, 1792, and when I became old enough I assisted my father in attending to the postoffice, and became familiar with his duties. From 1811 to 1816 I was the regular clerk in the office, assorting, making up, dispatching, opening, and distributing the mails. Pittsburg was then a small town, and I was well acquainted with all the stated visitors at the office who called regularly for their mails. So meager at that time were the mails that I could generally tell without looking whether or not there was anything for such persons, though I would usually look in order to satisfy them. I was married in 1815, and the next year my connection with the office ceased, except during the absences of my husband. I knew and distinctly remember Robert and Joseph Patterson, J. Harrison Lambdin, Silas Engles, and Sidney Rigdon. I remember Rev. Mr. Spaulding, but simply as one who occasionally called to inquire for letters. I remember there was an evident intimacy between Lambdin and Rigdon. They very often came to the office together. I particularly remember that they would thus come during the hour on Sabbath afternoon when the office was required to be open, and I remember feeling sure that Rev. Mr. Patterson knew nothing of this, or he would have put a stop to it. I do not know what position, if any, Rigdon filled in Patterson's store or printing office, but am well assured he was frequently, if not constantly, there for a large part of the time when I was clerk in the postoffice. I recall Mr. Engles saying that 'Rigdon was always hanging around the printing office.' He was connected with the tannery before he became a preacher, though he may have continued the business whilst preaching."⁷⁵

While this does not establish that Sidney Rigdon had a permanent abode in Pittsburg, nor that he was connected with Patterson's printing establishment, it yet explains why seemingly everybody who knew him reached that conclusion. It also establishes beyond doubt his undeniable intimacy with Lambdin and Engles, and by reason thereof, his possible access to Spaulding's manuscript, and doubt-

⁷⁵"Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 10-11.

less is one of the circumstances leading Spaulding to suspect Rigdon of the theft.

Rigdon Exhibits Spaulding's Manuscript

It will be remembered that in 1822-3 Rigdon was a Baptist preacher in Pittsburg. The Rev. John Winter, M. D., one of western Pennsylvania's early preachers, was then (1822-3) a school teacher in Pittsburg. Dr. Winter died at Sharon, Pa., in 1878.

On one occasion during this period (1822-3) Dr. Winter was in Rigdon's study when the latter took from his desk a large manuscript, and said, substantially, that a Presbyterian minister named Spaulding, whose health had failed, brought it to a printer to see if it would not pay to publish it. "It is a romance of the Bible." Dr. Winter did not read the manuscript, nor think any more of the matter until the Book of Mormon appeared. It was thought by members of Dr. Winter's family that he had committed his recollections of this interview to writing, but none could be found.

The authorities for Dr. Winter's statement are Rev. A. G. Kirk, to whom Dr. Winter communicated it in a conversation had at New Brighton, Pa., in 1870-1. The second authority is the Rev. A. J. Bonsall, a stepson of Dr. Winter, and for twenty-three years pastor of the Baptist Church at Rochester, Pa. To him the same story was often repeated by Dr. Winter. The third authority is Mrs. W. Irvine, a daughter of Dr. Winter, in 1881 resident at Sharon, Pa. Her statement has one or two details not already given, so I quote:

"I have frequently heard my father speak of Rigdon having Spaulding's manuscript, and that he had gotten it from the printers to read it as a curiosity; as such he showed it to father; and that at the time Rigdon had no intention of making the use of it that he afterwards did."⁷⁶

⁷⁶"Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 11-12. "Braden-Kelly Debate," 42.

Thus authenticated, Dr. Winter's statement may be given as much weight as though reduced to writing by himself.

Rigdon Foreknows the Coming and Contents of the Book of Mormon

The Rev. Adamson Bentley (whose wife was sister to Mrs. Sidney Rigdon) wrote the following to Walter Scott under date of January 22, 1841:

"I know that Sidney Rigdon told me that there was a book coming out, the manuscript of which had been found engraved on gold plates, as much as two years before the Mormon book made its appearance or had been heard of by me."

This statement was published in the *Millennial Harbinger* for 1844, with the following editorial note from Rev. Alexander Campbell: "The conversation alluded to in Brother Bentley's letter of 1841 was in my presence as well as his, and my recollection of it led me, some two or three years ago, to interrogate Brother Bentley touching his recollection of it, which accorded with mine in every particular, except the year in which it occurred, he placing it in the summer of 1827, I in the summer of 1826, Rigdon at the same time observing that in the plates dug up in New York there was an account, not only of the aborigines of this country, but also it was stated that the Christian religion had been preached in this country during the first century, just as we were preaching it in the Western Reserve."⁷⁷

It will be remembered that Rigdon lived for a time at his brother-in-law Bentley's house, and that it was Scott, Campbell, and Rigdon who, in Pittsburg, organized the Disciple Church in 1824 or 1825. The above statements were published in the *Millennial Harbinger* in 1844 (p. 39), twenty-two years before Rigdon's death, yet he never published

⁷⁷Besides *Millennial Harbinger* 1844, p. 39, see "Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 12 and 13. "Braden-Kelly Debate," 45.

a denial to either. It seems that before that publication Adamson Bentley was orally making statements, probably to the same effect, which remained undenied by Rigdon, though he published a card denouncing his brother-in-law.⁷⁸

Mrs. Amos Dunlap, a niece of Mrs. Rigdon, under date of Warren, O., December 7, 1879, writes this:

"When I was quite a child I visited Mr. Rigdon's family. He married my aunt. They at that time lived at Bainbridge, O. [1826-7]. During my visit Mr. Rigdon went to his bedroom and took from a trunk which he kept locked, a certain manuscript. He came out into the other room and seated himself by the fireplace and commenced reading it. His wife at that moment came into the room and exclaimed: 'What, you are studying that thing again?' or something to that effect. She then added: 'I mean to burn that paper.' He said, 'No indeed, you will not; this will be a great thing some day.' Whenever he was reading this he was so completely occupied that he seemed entirely unconscious of anything passing around him."⁷⁹

Since Rigdon never, in person or by anyone else, has claimed to have written any such manuscript of his own, in the light of other evidence here adduced, we are warranted in believing that to have been Spaulding's "Manuscript Found."

The Rev. D. Atwater, under date Mantua Station, O., April 26, 1873, three years before Rigdon's death, writes this:

"Soon after this the great Mormon defection came on us [Disciples]. Sidney Rigdon preached for us, and notwithstanding his extravagantly wild freaks, he was held in high repute by many. For a few months before his professed conversion to Mormonism, it was noticed that his wild, extravagant propensities had been more marked. That he knew before of the coming of the Book of Mormon is to me certain from what he said [during] the first of his visits at my father's some years before. He gave a wonderful description of the mounds and other antiquities found in some parts of America, and said that they must have been made by the aborigines. He said that there was a book to be published containing an account of those things. He spoke of these in his eloquent, enthusiastic style, as being a thing most extra-

⁷⁸*Evening and Morning Star*, 301.

⁷⁹"Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 12. "Braden-Kelly Debate," 45.

ordinary. Though a youth then, I took him to task for excessive enthusiasm on such a subject, instead of things of the gospel.

Of this statement Rigdon never made a denial. Dr. S. Rosa, under date of Painsville, O., Jan. 1851, writes, among other things, this:

"In the early part of the year 1830, when the Book of Mormon [and in November of which year Rigdon was converted], appeared in June, I was in company with Sidney Rigdon, and rode with him back a few miles. Our conversation was principally upon the new religion, as he was at that time a very popular preacher of the calling themselves 'Disciples' or Campbellites. He remarked that it was time for a new religion to spring up; that mankind were not ready for it. I thought he alluded to the Campbellite doctrine, and would not be long before something would make its appearance. He said that he thought of leaving Pennsylvania, and should be gone in a few months. I asked him how long. He said it would depend upon the circumstances. I began to think a little strange of his remarks, as I had never heard of the gospel. I left Ohio that fall and went to the state of New York to visit my friends who lived in Waterloo, not far from the city of New York. In November I was informed that my old neighbor and the Rev. Sidney Rigdon, were in Waterloo, and that they had come the dupes of Joe Smith's necromancies. It then occurred to me that Rigdon's new religion had made its appearance, and when I became acquainted with the Spaulding manuscript, I was confirmed in the opinion that he was at least accessory, if not the principal, in getting up this new religion."

This last article was first published in book form in 1864, thirty-four years before Rigdon's death, but never denied or explained by him. Whether this part of the article was published in the *Christian Observer* and *Recorder* I cannot say, but other portions of the article were, and received comment in a *Mormon* organ.⁸² This but emphasizes Rigdon's silence in Rosa's letter.

In Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled,"⁸³ it is said

⁸⁰"Early History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve," published in "Who Wrote the Book of Mormon?" 13. "Braden-Kelly Debate," 317.

⁸¹"Gleanings by the Way," 317. "Prophet of the Nineteenth Century," 172-3.

⁸²*Gospel Reflector*, 19.

⁸³Page 289. "Braden-Kelly Debate," 45.

don, during the incubation period of Mormonism between 1827 and 1830, preached new matters of doctrine which were afterwards found to be inculcated in the Mormon Bible. The evident purpose of all this was to prepare his congregation for the acceptance of Mormonism, and the end was most successfully achieved. Evidently this and the other circumstances showing Rigdon's foreknowledge of the forthcoming Book of Mormon, all combined with a guilty conscience, irresistibly impelled the making of an explanation tending to allay the suspicion that there was a conscious purpose in all such conduct. This defense is found in a revelation to Sidney Rigdon, dated December 7, 1830, at the alleged first meeting between Rigdon and Smith, and within one month after the former's conversion. The revelation, in part, says:

"Behold thou was sent forth, even as John, *To prepare the way before me, and before Elijah which should come, and thou knewest it not.*"⁸⁴

That Rigdon did prepare the way we knew before the revelation informed us of it. That it was done unconsciously we cannot even now believe.

Especially in the light of the foregoing evidence, this revelation must be construed as much more convincing proof of Rigdon's advance knowledge of the forthcoming Book of Mormon and its contents than even a tacit admission.

It is practically an admission of guilty knowledge, coupled with a transparent effort at warding off the inference of complicity in fraud by veiling the acts constituting the evidence in an assumed mysticism, which really deceives few aside from the mystic degenerate and the willing victim who enters the fold for opportunities to "fleece the flock of Christ."

⁸⁴Section 35, "Doctrine and Covenants." Supplement 14, *Millennial Star*, 50. The exact date of this revelation is December 7th, 1830, according to Howe's "Mormonism Unveiled," 107.

(To be continued.)

BOOK NOTICES.

BY GEORGE O. SEILHAMER.

The True Story of Paul Revere. His Midnight Ride. His Arrest and Court-Martial. His Useful Public Services. By Charles Ferris Gettemy. Illustrated from photographs. Little, Brown, and Company (Boston).

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's poem made of Paul Revere a hero of the romance of the Revolution. In Mr. Gettemy's book we have a more prosaic account of Revere the man, the engraver, and the patriot. He makes no effort to paint his subject as a romantic hero, or even as a leader, but recognizes from the outset the fact that Revere was essentially a follower. It is to be regretted, perhaps, that the biographer has found it necessary to demolish Longfellow's pretty story of the midnight ride. The author proves, by quoting Revere's own account, that almost all the stories that have been published in popular histories and school textbooks of the hanging of the lanterns in the belfry of the old North Church in Boston are inaccurate. That Longfellow is not responsible for this inaccuracy is shown by the fact that the erroneous accounts were published before as well as since the appearance of the poem. Even John Fiske represents Revere as crossing the Charles River under the guns of the "Somerset" man-of-war and waiting on the farther bank until he learned from a lantern suspended in the belfry of the North Church which way the troops had gone before he took horse to carry his message from Warren to Hancock and Adams at Lexington. Instead of being a mere timely signal to Revere, the lights in the belfry were intended as a warning to the people of the marching of the British troops, and were so understood. At the same time it must be conceded that it is to Longfellow's simple and tuneful ballad that most people owe their knowledge that there was such a man as Revere, who did something worthy of remembrance on the eve of the skirmish at Lexington. Mr. Gettemy's little book is a faithful and fairly well written record of this man Revere, his acts, and his character.

Paul Revere was of French extraction. The name was originally

Rivoire, and his father, after whom Paul was named, was Apollos Rivoire. This Apollos Rivoire was born in France in 1702, and died in Boston, January 22, 1754. He was the first to anglicize the name, calling himself Paul Revere. He was a gold and silversmith, and it was in his shop in Boston that young Paul acquired his art as an engraver by learning to draw and design patterns for pitchers, ewers, tankards, spoons, braisiers, and mugs. Besides following his father's occupation, young Revere added dentistry to his calling, and became an engraver of considerable skill for his period. As a patriotic engraver he brought out in 1765 his elaborate allegorical expression of American sentiment over the Stamp Act, and this was followed in 1766 by another allegorical picture presenting a view of the obelisk erected under the Liberty Tree in Boston upon the repeal of the act. These were followed by a third sketch, representing the Liberty Tree with an eagle in its topmost branches feeding her young, while an angel is seen approaching, bearing an ægis. The fourth and last of the series portrays King George III. in the guise of a Dutch widow, introducing America to the Goddess of Liberty. The most noteworthy of Revere's plates which are reproduced in this work, are his engraving of the Boston massacre, and his picture of Boston in 1768.

Revere took part in the Boston Tea Party, but his most important services were as the messenger of the Revolution. It was he who bore the account of the destruction of the tea in Boston harbor from the committee of correspondence to the Sons of Liberty in New York and the patriotic citizens of Philadelphia. A fac-simile of Revere's bill for messenger's service in 1775 is reproduced.

While Mr. Gettemy's work in no sense replaces E. H. Goss's more elaborate publication, it makes accessible to the general reader a story that ought to be read by every American, and it is especially commended to the younger readers, to whom Paul Revere cannot fail to be one of the most attractive of the men of 1776.

American Heroes and Heroines. By Pauline Carrington Bouve. Illustrated. Lothrop Publishing Company (Boston).

Among new books of American history specially intended for young readers, this is an acceptable contribution. The subjects comprise Father Marquette, Anne Hutchinson, Sir William Pepperell, Hannah Weston, Captain John Paul Jones, Israel Putnam, Molly Pitcher, Nathan Hale, Haym Salomon, Betty Zane, Stephen Decatur, Dolly Madison,

Stephen Van Rensselaer, Maria Mitchell, Dr. Kane, Margaret Haughery, Daniel Boone, Kit Carson, and Samuel Houston. None of these is to be regarded as a threadbare individuality in a work of such character. Some of them, indeed, as Hannah Weston, Haym Salomon, Betty Zane, and Margaret Haughery, will be new to most young people. These unhackneyed characters are well distributed over the country. Hannah Weston was a native of Machias, Me., who moulded her father's family pewter into bullets and carried them herself when no man could be found for the errand to O'Brien and the people of Machias, who were defending the liberty pole against the king's men in 1775. Haym Salomon was a Polish Hebrew, who came to Philadelphia in his youth and amassed a large fortune in his little shop in Front Street. He it was who supplied such members of the first continental congress as Lee, Bland, Jones, Mercer, and Randolph with funds from his own fortune to pay their bed, board, and laundry bills when they were in want of money. It was Betty Zane, born in the Shenandoah Valley, in what is now Berkeley County, W. Va., who went out from Fort Mifflin, surrounded by savages at the time of Lord Dunmore's war, to her father's cabin, sixty feet away, for a keg of powder to supply the garrison in the fort with the means of maintaining its defense. A hundred years later than these was Margaret Haughery, who was known to the poor of New Orleans as "Saint Margaret." Even the more familiar subjects of this book are, for the most part, only a little less unfamiliar than these. It is worthy of remark that the author is a cousin of Amelie Rives and a kinswoman of Thomas Nelson Page.

Heroes of Discovery in America. By Charles Morris. J. B. Lippincott Company (Philadelphia and London).

Mr. Charles Morris has added to his "Historical Tales" and "Half Hours with American Authors" an interesting series of sketches of the discoverers and explorers of America. The book opens with the story of Leif the Lucky and the discovery of Finland. This opening chapter is followed by brief but well written sketches of Christopher Columbus, the discoverer of America; Americus Vesputius, and the naming of America; the Cabots, and the discovery of the continent of North America; Balboa, the discoverer of the Pacific; Ponce de Leon and the Fountain of Youth; the voyages of Cortereal and Verrazano; Magellan and the circumnavigation of the globe; Cortez and the conquest of Mexico; Pizarro and the land of the Incas; the adventures of Cabeza de Vaca;

Francesco de Orellana and the exploration of the Amazon; Hernando de Soto and the discovery of the Mississippi; Francesco de Coronado and the Land of the Buffalo; Jacques Cartier and the discovery of the St. Lawrence; Jean Ribault and the Huguenots of Florida; Martin Fro-bisher and the Northwest Passage; Sir Francis Drake in the track of Magellan; the failure and fate of Sir Humphrey Gilbert; Sir Walter Raleigh, the prince of colonizers; Bartholomew Gosnold and other discoverers in New England; John Smith and the exploration of the Chesapeake; Henry Hudson and the discovery of the Hudson River; Samuel de Champlain, the founder of Quebec; and James Marquette, the first explorer of the Mississippi.

This is a highly instructive and entertaining work, within brief compass, on the adventures and achievements of the early discoverers and explorers of America, and is to be commended not only to young American readers, but to all who are not familiar with the story of American exploration and discovery.

An Express of '76. A Chronicle of the Town of York in the War for Independence. By Lindley Murray Hubbard. Illustrated by I. B. Beales. Little, Brown, and Company (Boston).

Stories of New York in the early years of the Revolution were once a common enough product of the writers of American fiction, but in recent years the appearance of a romantic novel of the times that tried men's souls has not been frequent. Mr. Hubbard's story is all the more welcome on this account. It purports to be based on the journal of General Hubbard, the early sheets of which had long been missing, and were only found when the old Hubbard residence in New York was torn down a few years ago. The story that follows the general's own account tells of his first arrival in the town of New York on an important mission in the summer of '76, where he joined the army under Washington several months before the battle of Long Island and the evacuation of the city. It gives us many curious glimpses of the New York of that time, and brings us into intimate personal relations with Washington, Franklin, Burr, Hamilton, Putnam and many other heroes of the Revolution.

One of the opening chapters recounts the incidents of a dinner at Fraunce's Tavern, at which the Chevalier Conway sat at the head of the table, and which was participated in by Colonel Duer, Major Burr, Colonel Morgan, Major Pinckney, Captain Graydon, and others. Af-

ter the first course Dr. Franklin was introduced and presented to the guests his friend, Mr. Thomas Paine, with whom it afterward appeared he had made the journey from Philadelphia. Young Hubbard, who had come as an express from Boston with important dispatches, was also a guest at the dinner, from which he went, guided by Morgan, to present his message to the commander-in-chief. As the story progresses, the Tryon Plot is introduced, followed by the trial of Sergeant Hickey of the Life Guard, at which Jonathan Hubbard was one of the chief witnesses. For his testimony on this occasion and his patriotic services to his country Hubbard was commissioned a lieutenant and assigned to the staff of Colonel Trumbull. As Trumbull was himself a staff officer while he was in the army, this assignment of Hubbard to his staff may be rather weak history, but it serves to make very good fiction. It may be questioned, however, whether Trumbull's Connecticut idiom was decided enough to make him compliment his aide on his "putty new uniform," or to say in regard to an order he had just given, "Speak to me in the morning abaout it. I'll have other instructions." The heroine of the story is Lady Claremont, who remained in New York during Sir William Howe's occupation of the city, and then returned to England, where she married a distinguished peer and diplomat.

To attempt any analysis of Mr. Lindley Murray Hubbard's plot would be to tell the story. It is enough to say that it presents a striking picture of the New York of 1776.

The True Benjamin Franklin. By Sidney George Fisher. Fifth edition, with an appendix. J. B. Lippincott Company (Philadelphia).

The later editions of Mr. Fisher's "Franklin" contain an appendix, in which the author presents all the proofs extant in regard to Franklin's alleged daughter, Mrs. Foxcroft. The propriety of this discussion is exceedingly doubtful. It may be conceded that Mrs. Foxcroft was acknowledged by Franklin as his daughter, but as nothing whatever is known of her mother, and almost as little of herself previously to her marriage with Foxcroft, the long discussion in Mr. Fisher's book with the appendix must be regarded as lacking in dignity. In his "Autobiography" Franklin acknowledged so many errata that a discussion of his faults with as much amplitude as Mr. Fisher has given to the Foxcroft story would make a much larger book than this to which Mr. Fisher has given the name of "The True Benjamin Franklin." That Franklin

was very far from being a saint, most people who know his history will concede, but his virtues were of a nature that they overbalance his faults, and his services to his country were so important that the great Benjamin Franklin will always tend to make the true Benjamin Franklin of little importance in the opinion of his admirers. This is the age of research in little things, and Mr. Fisher's book is a good example of its kind. It will please readers who like to see the scandals of the past uncovered when these scandals besmirch great names, but his revelations will always give greater satisfaction to the prurient than to the prudent.

Lincoln the Lawyer. By Frederick Trever Hill. The Century Company (New York).

Mr. Hill's narrative of Abraham Lincoln's career at the bar will generally be accepted as an important contribution to what is already a voluminous Lincoln literature. The author is a native of Brooklyn, who was graduated at Yale and at the Columbia Law School. As a lawyer his attention was naturally directed to the absence of detail relating to Mr. Lincoln's twenty-three years at the bar in the current biographies of the great American president. Feeling that this neglect was too important to be longer overlooked, Mr. Hill set to work to unearth the story of Lincoln the Lawyer. The result fully justifies the undertaking. Much of the material was gathered at first hand. Judge Lawrence Weldon, who was the last survivor of the lawyers who tramped the old Eighth Illinois Circuit with Lincoln, was perhaps the most important source of information consulted by Mr. Hill in his researches, but other lawyers who practiced with Lincoln at different periods of his career, and who tried cases with him and against him, also contributed many important facts.

The result is that Mr. Lincoln's leading qualifications are placed upon a higher plane than would have been the case if this study had not been made. We now learn that Lincoln's legal training during his twenty-three years at the bar was in reality the prelude to the great work and the high achievements to which he was destined as a statesman. Believing that Lincoln's legal training proved invaluable to him at critical moments of the presidency, Mr. Hill has gone further and shows the unlikelihood that Lincoln would have been called to his high station at the most critical period in American history if he had not practiced at the bar. Mr. Hill's work is remarkable for its fullness in anecdote and incident, and it is enriched by the reproduction of many interesting por-

traits and curious documents. The portraiture includes nearly all the eminent lawyers with whom Mr. Lincoln practiced in the Illinois courts—such as Judges Weldon and Reynolds, John T. Stuart, Stephen T. Logan, David Davis, William H. Herndon, Leonard Swett, and N. B. Judd. Among the illustrations are also pictures of many of the old court-houses in which Lincoln's voice was heard at the bar. One of the appendices gives a list of the cases in the supreme court of Illinois in which he appeared. The number of these cases was one hundred and seventy-three.

PRICE, 50 CENTS

November, 1906

No. 6

AMERICAN HISTORICAL MAGAZINE



The Publishing Society of New York
41 La Fayette Place
New York

~~Compendium of the Genealogical Records and Biographical~~
Biography of Selected Families of Early American
History, Recognized Social Standing, and Special Distinction.
by W. W. Spooner.

All the memories in this work are compiled under the
supervision of the principal representatives of the families
named, and by special arrangement in each case. The portraits
are steel engravings exclusively, mounted on Japanese vellum
with steel engravings, similarly mounted, of historic family
ancestral castles in Europe, etc., and numerous beautiful etch-
ings and steel plates of coats of arms.

Bound octavo, sometimes, printed on specially made
Antique Old Stratford double-edge paper, colored or (for the
expensive editions) illuminated initial letters; variously be-
coming to the price of the edition or the taste of the subject.

Correspondence is invited from families naming within
scope of the work.

Author.

HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

PUBLISHING SOCIETY OF NEW YORK

41 Lafayette Place, New York

**Inquiries in relation to any of the works announced on the following pages
should be sent to the above address.**

(IN PREPARATION)

MEMORIAL CYCLOPEDIA

OF THE

TWENTIETH CENTURY

Devoted to Personal Memoirs of Those who have Contributed to the Advancement of the Intellectual, Moral, and Material Interests of the United States. Edited by W. W. Spooner, with the co-operation of a distinguished corps of advisory editors and contributors, representing all portions of the country. Illustrated with numerous portraits.

The plan of this Cyclopedia is to present in a series of volumes, issued from year to year, very complete, exact, and excellent memoirs of Americans of reputation and usefulness, whose life careers terminate in the present century. No biographies of the living will be included, or of any others than citizens of the United States.

So far as possible, all material will be obtained at first hand, and the articles will be prepared under the direct supervision of the surviving representatives of the deceased. Particular attention devoted to genealogy.

By subscription exclusively.

WISCONSIN

IN THREE CENTURIES, 1634-1905. Narrative of Three Centuries in the Making of an American Commonwealth. Illustrated with Numerous Engravings of Historic Scenes and Landmarks, Portraits, and Facsimiles of Rare Prints, Documents, and Old Maps. Board of Editors and Writers: Reuben Gold Thwaites, Secretary State Historical Society; Hon. Emil Baensch, Curator State Historical Society; William Ward Wight, M. A., President State Historical Society; Joseph Stephen Laboule, D. D.;

Henry Edward Legler, Curator State Historical Society; Henry Colin Campbell, Secretary Board of Editors and Writers. Four Volumes, bound in cloth.

Volume I, to the end of the War of the Revolution; Volume II, to the admission of the State; Volume III, to the end of the Civil War. Volume IV, subsequent development.

To advance subscribers only.

THE AMERICAN FAMILY

By F. N. Hagar, A. B., LL. B., Cornell Class of 1873. This is a sociological work, in which the author deals with the great questions, including birth, marriage, and survival, which are of vital interest to all good Americans. The idea of "Race Suicide," though nowhere mentioned by that name in the book, runs through all its pages, and the author suggests to his readers remedies to save the American people from degeneration and extinction.

The book is, in short, a scientific compendium upon the family, made inviting and attractive by a forceful and literary style infused with a penetrating and discriminating spirit of love. Like Wagner's "Simple Life," it is closely written and requires attentive reading.

Handsomely bound in cloth, 188 pages. Sent post-paid to any address. One dollar and fifty cents.

THE HISTORY OF THE ARMY OF THE POTOMAC

By S. L. French. The first authentic history of the campaigns of McClellan, Pope, Burnside, and Hooker. A large octavo work of four hundred pages, handsomely bound in cloth. Illustrated. Sent post-paid to any address. Two dollars and fifty cents.

NEW ATLAS OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Containing a separate map of each County of the State; also a street map for each of the Seventy-three Cities, Villages, and Boroughs. Compiled from the latest official and private surveys. Comprehensively colored. Each map is mounted on muslin; fully indexed and substantially bound. Twenty-five dollars.

SURVEY MAP CO.

41 Lafayette Place, New York.

COLLEGE PUBLICATIONS

CORNELL UNIVERSITY: A HISTORY

By Waterman Thomas Hewitt, A. B., Ph.D., Professor of German Language and Literature in the University. Four volumes, beautifully bound in the University colors, carnelian and white. Numerous full-page engravings, including portraits,

views of the University, photographs of the athletic and other student organizations, etc. Twenty-five dollars.

Volumes I and II are devoted to the general history of Cornell University, its various colleges and departments; Volume III to aspects of student life, boating, football, baseball, and other records; Volume IV is a complete register, so far as possible, of all who have taught or studied at Cornell.

"The work is characterized throughout by thoroughness and accuracy. All must acknowledge the debt which Cornell owes to Professor Hewitt for the years of labor he has spent in collecting and arranging the materials for this monumental history."—*Cornell Era*.

PHOTOGRAPHIC ALBUM OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Comprising more than three hundred full-page illustrations, beautifully printed; officers, professors, benefactors, views, athletic teams, and other student organizations; covering the entire history of the University. Sent post-paid to any address. Two dollars.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY: A HISTORY

Its Origin and Development, its Founders, Benefactors, Officers, Instructors, and Students, Student Enterprises and Interests. Edited by Arthur Herbert Wilde, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in the College of Liberal Arts. Four volumes, bound in the University color, purple. Elaborately and elegantly illustrated. Twenty-five dollars.

The edition printed is limited to the advance subscription list.

A few unsold copies of the following State histories will be sent, pre-paid, by the publishers. Price furnished on application.

NEW JERSEY

AS A COLONY AND AS A STATE; One of the Original Thirteen. By Francis Bazley Lee. Associate Board of Editors: William S. Stryker, LL.D., William Nelson, A. M., Garret D. W. Vroom, Ernest C. Richardson, Ph.D. Four Volumes, cloth, illustrated.

HISTORY OF OREGON

The Growth of an American State. By Horace S. Lyman. Associate Board of Editors: Harvey W. Scott, Charles B. Beltinger, and Frederic G. Young. Four volumes, cloth, illustrated.

HISTORY OF IOWA

from the Earliest Times to the Beginning of the Twentieth Century. By Benjamin F. Gue. Four volumes, cloth. Illustrated with photographic views of the natural scenery of the State, public buildings, pioneer life, etc.; with portraits and biographies of notable men and women of Iowa.

TO AUTHORS

The Publishing Society of New York would be pleased to correspond with authors having manuscripts to dispose of. Advantageous propositions will be made for all acceptable manuscripts on historical and genealogical subjects, social and scientific problems, biography, or in the department of general literature.



dirt, and grease.



STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

MAP.— $\frac{1}{4}$ Regular Size



MAP.— $\frac{1}{4}$ Regular Size



17th Street, New York, N.Y. 10011

